

struction, purchase of buildings, and other matters; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 5408. A bill restricting importations of wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 5409. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE (by request):

H. R. 5410. A bill for the relief of the license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5411. A bill to provide for retirement of certain officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5412. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5413. A bill to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Marie Gorak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5415. A bill for the relief of James F. Petty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 5416. A bill granting a pension to Abiah Wombles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1529. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 26 members of the Woman's Auxiliary to Beaver County Medical Society of Allegheny, Beaver County, Pa., opposing Senate bill 1606 and House bill 4730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1530. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of 2,530 officers and enlisted men stationed at Harmon Field, Guam, with reference to the War Department's demobilization program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1531. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Council on Education, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the adoption of House Joint Resolution 305 and Senate Joint Resolution 135; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Edgar W. Beckett, First Methodist Church, Hyattsville, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, Thou who art high above all and yet strangely near to each one of us, we come into Thy holy presence. We come to offer unto Thee

ourselves, that we might hold aloft the torch to a people groping in a fog—groping to find the way. Truly in us is the destiny of a great nation. We are the channels through which Thou must act; we are Thine instruments, Thy hands. We pray to be holy, acceptable unto Thee. Walk Thou through the corridors of our hearts, open Thou every secret door, unlock every cupboard, and whatsoever Thou dost find unclean therein cleanse it. We want nothing within to mar the beauty and activity of Thy spirit. This we pray in the name of our Saviour, who is indeed the light of the world. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 480. An act to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden and Dougherty, and for other purposes;

S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier;

S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler;

S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock;

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy;

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones;

S. 1332. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor;

S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son, Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944;

S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; and

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saitonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been excused and is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of law, the Chair appoints the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] members of the

Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy. The Chair will state that under the law the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is an ex officio member of the Board.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on November 30, 1945, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 350 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in him, together with a statement for the reason of such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

EXPENDITURES BY THE ALASKA RAILROAD

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 6, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act;

S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on civil international air transport routes from the United States;

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes.

MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial from Local Union 8168, United Mine Workers of America, of Monmouth, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 4903, the so-called Case antistrike bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition signed by a large number of members of the bar of the State of New York who approve the action of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in their support of S. 101, the bill to create a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, and to provide for cloture. I ask unanimous consent to present the petition and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached as follows:

New York City, February 2, 1946.

We, the undersigned, members of the bar of the State of New York, support the proposal to establish by Federal legislation a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. Furthermore, we believe that the present filibuster in the Senate constitutes a denial of the basic principles of American democracy and should be ended by cloture.

COMPULSORY PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING—MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a memorial signed by Rev. Floyd L. Jarboe, pastor, and many other members of the Appanoose Church of the Brethren, of Overbrook, Kans., expressing their opposition to compulsory military training in peacetime. I ask unanimous consent to present the memorial, and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee

on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

OVERBROOK, KANS.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the Appanoose Church of the Brethren and/or of the surrounding community, are deeply concerned with the problems now confronting our Nation. We view with great apprehension the movement now on to pass a peacetime conscription law. We believe this to be both un-American and un-Christian.

We commend you for the stand you have taken in opposition to the passage of such a law. We urge you to continue to use your influence to prevent the passage of such legislation. We believe the resolution introduced by Representative NEELY, of West Virginia (H. J. Res. 269), is worthy of consideration and support by the other Members of Congress.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 192) to investigate matters relating to the handling of insolvent railroads, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 925) thereon, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of January 1946 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

FEBRUARY 7, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

WALTER F. GEORGE, Chairman.

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual ¹	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Fred R. Miller.....	7535 17th St. NW.....	Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.....	\$5,810
Bertha M. Heck.....	1631 Euclid St. NW.....	do.....	2,169

¹ Both assigned to work of permanent Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation, room 316-A, extension 1224.

FEBRUARY 5, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1946, in compliance with the terms

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell.....	113 Park Blvd. SE.....	Federal Communications Commission.....	\$1,900

B. K. WHEELER, Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HART:

S. 1805. A bill to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1806. A bill for the relief of Capt. John F. Lynch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1807. A bill to provide for recognition of certain active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1808. A bill to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1809. A bill to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 1810. A bill for the relief of Adrian E. Butler; to the Committee on Immigration.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$4,000."

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE FEPC—A FAIR LABEL ON AN UNFAIR BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The FEPC—A Fair Label on an Unfair Bill," delivered by him over the radio on February 6, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CITIZEN AND FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The Citizen and Foreign Policy," delivered by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., before a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association, at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 4, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

GERMANY IS OUR PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY DR. KARL BRANDT

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Germany Is Our Problem," by Dr. Karl Brandt, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEXT STEP IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article relating to the next step in international relations, written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Los Angeles Times of November 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a few remarks, on condition that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator can obtain unanimous consent, I will yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the financial and economic condition of our Nation—and of the entire world—requires that we formulate a definite financial policy in our dealings with other nations. This policy, I believe, should be based upon good, solid, and accepted practical business principles. It cannot be based upon altruism, wishful thinking, or visionary idealism.

When I was a young man, a friend who was a successful businessman, in the course of giving me some advice on a fundamental principle of business, recounted to me a story of a merchant in a western town and one of his customers. The merchant was in the general mercantile business, selling almost everything the farmers and ranchers in that area needed in order to make and harvest a crop. Many of the farmers carried large accounts in his store until their crops were harvested and sold.

One of these customers—we will call him John Smith—owned a great deal of land, but unfortunately had spread out too much and his land was heavily mortgaged. He was what we used to call land poor. He had a difficult time meeting his interest payments. But because many of his farms were rented, he was a good customer of the merchant and the latter financed him from season to season.

The time came, however, when Smith was unable to pay on his accounts. The merchant told him that unless he would make some substantial payment he could no longer afford to carry him along. Smith became angry, recalling to the merchant the business he had given him over the years and threatening to quit trading with him. When the merchant stood firm, Smith carried out his threat and took the cash he had, which he could have paid on the account, and began doing business on a cash basis with a competitor across the street. The merchant lost his best customer.

But the time came when Smith was again in difficulty; when he needed credit and had none. He went back to the merchant and said to him: "We have done business together for many years that made money for both of us. Why cannot we do so again? Why cannot you open my account? I will pay out." The merchant patiently explained that he could not extend additional credit when Smith already owed him so substantial an unpaid account. That sort of business, he added, would bankrupt him.

However, the merchant owned a farm adjoining one of Smith's. "Smith," he said, "that pasture land of yours adjoining mine is not doing you much good. It is mortgaged; you cannot sell it; and

you cannot sell any of your land, under present conditions, to square your debts. But to help you get on your feet so that we can get back on a business basis, and to show you my good faith, I will buy that piece of pasture land and you can settle up your account. Then we can go back to doing business on a business basis. But I want you to know that this transaction is conditioned on your paying your account regularly as funds come in from the sale of your products."

Smith became angry and accused the merchant of taking advantage of him. The merchant said, "All right. You go ahead and do business wherever you can. I cannot collect my account from you because your land and all your property are already mortgaged. I made you a proposition that would make money for both of us. If you do not want to take it then there is nothing I can do."

Smith went his way. Things became worse for him. The banks threatened to foreclose, so finally he went back to his friend, the merchant, and told him he was willing to settle his account in the manner suggested. The transaction was completed and Smith made money in the future and so did the merchant. The point of the story is that Smith never would have paid if the merchant had not insisted upon an equitable settlement.

Everyone on the floor of the Senate knows the truth of this story. Everyone within the sound of my voice knows that it is not good business to be lax in granting credit. It results not only in the loss of the customer, but all others who trade with you know your failing, and those who have the inclination to do so, will demand the same loose credit.

Mr. President, now we are confronted with the question of whether we should approve a loan to Great Britain in the sum of \$3,750,000,000. Let me say first that I am one who has a great deal of respect for Great Britain. I have great respect for the British people and consider the friendship of their nation to ours as worth much to the people of both countries. I voted for every measure to assist them before and after our country became involved in World War II. I have done everything within my power to see to it that we were a real ally in the war and that no wedge was driven between our two nations.

I was in England a few months ago and had the honor to meet and speak with that great statesman and former Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill. I spoke with many members of Parliament. I talked with leaders and industrialists, I talked with cabbies and porters, restaurant waiters and shopkeepers. I think I know something of Britain's economic, social, and financial problems, and I am sincerely anxious to help her meet them. I want to be of whatever service I can to assist the people of Great Britain in solving those problems. But, Mr. President, I do not believe that we can assist them by doing business on any other than a business basis. To do business on any other basis would not be fair to the people we in Congress represent, or even fair to the British people themselves.

It is fair and proper to ask here, What have been our business dealings with

Great Britain in the past? Let us cast up our accounts.

First. The fact remains that today the British Government owes the United States about four and one-third billion dollars principal and two and one-eighth billion dollars in interest, resulting from loans made more than 20 years ago at the time of the First World War.

Second. During World War II we gave to Britain the stupendous total of more than \$25,000,000,000 in goods and money under the program known as lend-lease. That is the net amount with reverse lend-lease deducted. We learn now, from the Twenty-first Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, submitted January 31, 1946, that it is intended to settle this tremendous credit with the United Kingdom for some \$650,000,000. And even this is not the final figure; it may be less than that. Moreover, this final settlement contemplates the taking over of vast amounts of surplus materials in Europe. And all this is to be done, apparently, without the Congress having anything to say about it.

We gave this tremendous assistance to Britain because it was necessary, as everyone knows, to save England from destruction. But we gave it, I believed and the American people believed, on the basis that we would get something back in return. I seem to remember something about a house being on fire, and we loaning the hose. We would get a new hose back, it was declared. Now, apparently, we are to get a settlement of 2½ cents on the dollar, and perhaps not even that. I do not believe anyone expected that we would receive full payment in cash, but we were certainly led to believe that this country would receive some other valuable consideration which, at least in some measure, would come near equaling the value of the material furnished under lend-lease. Certainly, if this was not the belief and the expectation, we would have provided that lend-lease was to be a grant, a gift without strings.

Oh, I know it will be said that lend-lease was our share of the war. But I am not one of those who agree that Great Britain was fighting our war. Yes; she later became our ally and she helped fight the war as our ally, just as she did in World War I. Nor am I attempting to detract in the slightest degree from the credit that is due British citizens who fought and died for their country. They were good Allies and paid a price in this war.

But does anyone question that we did our part in World War I? Does anyone question that we did our part in World War II? We did our share, not alone in money and material, but in blood and sweat and tears as well. Even Mr. Churchill commented that we furnished the overwhelming majority of the fighting troops who crossed the channel and made the drive that eventually crushed the enemy. Does anyone question that we shouldered the major burden in the war against Japan? I do not make these assertions boastfully. I am not one of those who wave our flag in the face of other nations with clarion shouts that "We won the war." But I do not want

anyone to say to me that the people of the United States did not do their full part—even if debts owing us were paid in full.

Third. I come now to the third point. I have mentioned the debts of World War I and the lend-lease payments. A few months ago we passed legislation establishing an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank, known generally as the Bretton Woods agreements. By its terms we bound ourselves to subscribe some \$6,000,000,000 to the Fund and the Bank, solely for the purpose of aiding nations devastated economically by the war to get back on their feet. Britain's quota to both was \$2,600,000,000. While I recognize that our subscriptions to the Fund and Bank are not solely for the benefit of Britain, let us see where we stand in this international financial aid to the world:

Britain owes us \$6,500,000,000 from the First World War; we extended upward of \$25,000,000,000 net in lend-lease; we have committed ourselves to pay into the International Fund and Bank almost \$6,000,000,000 more; and now we are asked to make what amounts to a partially interest-free loan of another \$3,750,000,000 to Britain.

It seems about time that we ought to take stock; it seems that we ought to apply the principles of the small-town merchant of whom I spoke earlier; it seems that we ought to see whether all this is good business. The question is whether we should lend this money, and if we do, should we require some form of settlement of past debts?

In considering this loan, there are certain questions which we must first ask ourselves:

First, does the borrower need the money? So far as we know, the answer is "Yes." Perhaps we do not know as much about this phase of the proposition as a good banker would want to know, but that fault lies in other agencies of Government. That is why there is quibbling about such things as the vast amount of British assets in this country in the shape of American securities which were not fully used in the war; the sharp difference in the amount that Britain and the United States expended in the war; Britain's assets in her colonial empire and the Dominions.

Second, can the lender afford to make the loan? On any practical, sound business basis, the answer is obviously "No" until their old account is settled.

There are those who argue that our own economic stability and future is involved in this loan to Britain. A careful reading of the parliamentary debates when the pending loan was under consideration by Commons will make clear, I am sure, that neither Britain's nor our own future would be jeopardized by failure of the loan.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to an article by Mr. Werner Knop which appears in the Saturday Evening Post for February 9. The article is headed:

The British businessman is cheerful. With huge markets waiting and her industrial plant in better shape than at the beginning of the war, England confidently expects a full-sized boom. Mr. Attlee? Oh, well, that's just one of those things, you know.

I should like to quote a small portion of the article:

Speaking to a gathering of industrialists, Lord Davidson, president of the Engineering Industries Association, said, "I believe this country is on the threshold of a tremendous recovery, which engineering, despite all apparent difficulties, will lead." The same optimistic sentiment is being echoed in company-chairmen speeches, although not all would go quite as far as Mr. Samuel Courtauld, chairman of a \$170,000,000 textile company, who states: "As regards the future, I say without hesitation that the outlook is brighter than ever."

Further along in the article, in discussing the financial situation which exists in Britain, this is said:

The same optimism exists with regard to the home market. During 6 years of war, the British consumer has been allowed to buy only the barest necessities of life. At the same time the net income of every Briton, after payment of income tax and surtax, has exactly doubled. Whether he liked it or not, he had to put aside a large slice of his income in savings, and at \$35,000,000,000 his wartime savings are equal to something like 25 years' savings at the prewar rate.

To this tremendous future purchasing power must be added another \$14,000,000,000 which have accumulated as bank deposits, and \$20,000,000,000 for various post-war credit schemes, service gratuities and war-damage payments.

The article further states:

The ending of lend-lease provided one of those very rare occasions when the British seemed to lose their sense of balance. Responsibility for this lay mainly with Prime Minister Attlee, who grossly exaggerated the gap between Britain's income and expenditure of dollars. He claimed it to be \$5,000,000,000 a year, whereas, when allowance is made for the stoppage of munition supplies and the cutting out of all nonessential imports, Britain's deficit with the United States need not exceed \$900,000,000. As Britain has during the war built up a gold and dollar reserve of more than \$2,000,000,000, the difficulties of bridging the dollar gap for a period of a year or two would have been by no means insurmountable, even without American aid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood from the quotations which the Senator just read that the British have saved \$35,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Plus \$14,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Plus \$20,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is what the article states.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That makes a total of \$69,000,000,000. Great Britain has a population which is a little less than a third of that of the United States. Comparing our savings with theirs, the figures show that they have saved as much as we have during the war period.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his comments. That is exactly the point I want to make. Where is the United States to get the money for this \$3,750,000,000 loan? From the American taxpayer, of course. We shall have to float more bonds; go further into debt.

If the British people have this tremendous amount of savings—\$69,000,000,000, according to the Saturday Evening Post article which appeared only this week—why doesn't the British Government borrow from its own citizens? Their savings are apparently tremendous; the people are seeking investments for their funds. What better investment for British citizens than the securities of their own Government? Why a procedure which requires American citizens to make another \$3,750,000,000 loan right after having "given" the British \$23,000,000,000 in lend-lease?

Mr. President, let me emphasize here that both they and we recognize that the loan would be helpful—helpful to Britain in hastening her getting on her feet; helpful to us if for no other reason than a partial equilibrium may be restored in the world.

It is said that Britain needs this credit and needs it now. That statement seems to make light, indeed, of the Bretton Woods agreement and Britain's rights as a borrower from the International Monetary Fund. It is argued that this credit will assist her to meet the expected deficit in her balance of payments during the next 6 years. Of course, it will. But who will assist the United States to meet her deficits in the years ahead? It is said that the loan will enable Britain to buy from the world the supplies of food and raw materials which are essential to the life and work of the British people. Of course; but to what extent does that help the United States? There is no compulsion upon Britain to spend the \$3,750,000,000 in the United States; and even if there were, that would not make the loan a good one or a necessary one. We should have experience enough to know what that course leads to—or have we forgotten the experience of 1929?

It is asserted that the loan will keep open a market for those surpluses of the United States which are customarily exported to the United Kingdom. Again, we may ask, What kind of a market? Britain will buy here what she can buy profitably and to her own welfare.

Are there any arrangements that Britain will favor our markets over those of the Empire? Of course not; nor should we expect it. And even in our best years of trading with Britain, what did our foreign trade amount to? Are we going to loan nearly \$4,000,000,000 to do a billion dollars' worth of business a year? Is that sound or sensible?

Those, we are told, are the important short-term purposes of the \$3,750,000,000 credit to Great Britain.

These are some of the matters which it is well for us to consider.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is any question that if Great Britain had this amount of money it would improve her trade relations with the United States. But suppose she does buy goods from us with the loan. If it were never to be paid, we might as well give them the goods in the first place. But would that be good business? Would that help the United States? The answer, of course, is "No." We can only judge as to whether Great Britain will repay this loan by her actions in the past.

So, Mr. President, it is my opinion that Great Britain should settle her past debts with us before we make a new loan. Oh, it will be said that if she had this amount of money, she would not need the loan. I concede Great Britain is not financially able to pay us what she owes in dollars, but she can settle her account with us by giving us property rights.

I said a moment ago that I believed we had done our full share in World War II. Part of that share was the expenditure of billions of dollars, and the sweat and blood and lives of our men, in the building of submarine and naval bases, air bases, and communications centers in many places throughout the world. American cement and American steel, American brains and American brawn, went into miles of concrete runways, hangars, buildings, docks, and roads all over the world. In every case the contracts limited the use by the Allies of these facilities to the period of the war. Even in the destroyer-for-bases deal—a deal that was certainly as much to Britain's advantage as to ours—the 99-year leasehold barred permanently the commercial use of the facilities we built for the successful carrying on of the war. And so today we find ourselves giving up and moving out of air bases and communications centers and naval depots and refueling stations that we built and maintained; we find ourselves bargaining painfully with an ally for rentals for the use of air strips which are essential to the carrying on of world commercial aviation.

Understandably, because Britain is a world empire, many of these naval and air bases are on British soil or on British mandated territory or in lands over which Britain exercises a powerful persuasive force.

When this question of a loan is presented before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I propose to place upon this loan conditions in the following form:

To direct the negotiation of an agreement for permanent American rights to bases, instead of 99-year leases; to eliminate the existing provision restricting use of the bases to military purposes only; to permit peacetime commercial use by the United States of other bases built by this country in lands owned by Britain and in states owned or controlled by her; and for such other payment in goods, property, or money as Britain may be able to make without injury to her financial standing. This agreement is to be submitted to Congress for approval, and such approval would authorize the loan.

I do not believe that our Government has the moral right to make such a loan except upon a strictly business basis. For my part, I am much more willing to appropriate \$4,000,000,000, or even \$40,000,000,000, for loans to individual American citizens who may require funds to help them in business. I believe that such citizens are better credit risks; that there is a far better chance of repayment; and that if there were default in payment we, at least, would have the satisfaction of knowing that the money was spent in the United States

and for the benefit directly and indirectly of this Nation.

I cannot, for the life of me, see any merit in extending a loan to a foreign nation at an interest rate half of that we charge an American veteran and then making provision that even that low-interest payment may be waived under certain conditions, unless we are to receive benefits which make up for this difference. What is the justification for such a double standard? Are American soldiers and sailors, not attempting to rehabilitate themselves into our economic life stream, less precious to us economically and financially than a foreign power, however important that power may be and however important it may be that that power becomes once again a strong economic factor in the world?

There is also good argument against permitting foreign nations to float their loans here, on the premise that our Government will step out of the picture and merely permit those of our citizens who think these nations good credit risks to purchase their bonds. I think that is unsound procedure, on two grounds. In the first place, no investor is going to buy a bond at the rate of interest proposed in the British loan, and not even the most patriotic British citizen will invest in a security on which the interest may be waived by the lender for the first 5 years. Not even in the darkest days of the war did Britain sell a security of that character. Secondly, I do not think it a good policy to encourage or allow a large number of our citizens to invest their earnings in bonds of another country, thereby becoming, in many instances, personally more interested in the financial success of those nations than in the success of their own country.

I am of the firm opinion that the overwhelming majority of our citizens are friendly to Britain, desire to see her re-establish herself, make herself economically strong again, become in a position so that she can take steps to free colonial peoples of overlordship, and take her accustomed place in the family of nations.

But I am also of the firm opinion that the overwhelming majority of our people are opposed and will oppose the granting of this large loan to Britain now, unless we can show them that we are getting something for our money.

The American people are not fools. They know what the war cost us, in dollars as well as in blood. They are paying taxes on that cost now, and their children's children for many generations will continue to bear the burden. It will be difficult indeed to convince them that we should make a loan to a foreign power at an interest rate half of what we demand from our own veterans and with a right not to pay any interest at all for 5 years; it will be even more difficult to convince them that such a loan will be of any direct help to this Nation in an economic way in the years ahead; it will be hardest of all to tell them that such a loan does not open the door to other loans to many other nations, requests which we will not be able to refuse without making open enemies of many powers.

So, Mr. President, unless we in Congress use realism and hard common sense, unless we attach conditions to this loan which make sense to the American people, we shall find that we have lost the confidence of the people.

Mr. President, my proposal for payment by Great Britain of her debt in part, or in whole, would not, in the words of Mr. Churchill, liquidate the British Empire. This would not in any way hurt the trade of the British Empire unless she expects to employ unfair advantages against the United States. But it would permit us to realize something from the billions of dollars we have spent in this and the last war. This is no novel scheme of payment. After I decided to offer this reservation to the joint resolution, and began to draft it, I noticed in the January 31 edition of the Washington Evening Star an article which I desire to read:

BRITAIN SHOULD PAY UNITED STATES DEBT IN BASES, CANADIAN DECLARES

ALBANY, N. Y., January 31—Canada's war-time munitions chief—

And it is to be noted that he is not merely an ordinary citizen of Canada—said last night that Britain should pay her debt to America in Western Hemisphere bases or by other mutually satisfactory settlement.

William Flockert Drysdale, speaking as a private citizen, declared the grim specter of debt forgiveness must not arise in this new age of infinite threats and dangers as it so unhappily arose after the First World War.

Mr. Drysdale, in a speech before the Albany County Historical Society, said Britain's obligations to the United States "are and remain debts until they are fully acknowledged and liquidated."

"Contractual arrangements for payment," he said, "could be either by permanent cession of by leases of lengthened tenure of present or different lands in or contiguous to the waters of the Western Hemisphere, and/or by such other media of installment payments as are mutually satisfactory."

He said England's staggering war losses, especially the destruction or damaging of 4,000,000 homes, must be replaced "if Britain is to continue as a useful ally in the company of enlightened nations."

"Between neighbors and allies and comrades in past times of peril, that may arise again, there must be no sordid question of the cost of such human and necessary help. * * * Past, present, and future they are debts of moneys and credits of health and safety, especially called for and gallantly provided."

Do we in the United States have less interest in the welfare of our Nation than has Mr. Drysdale, of Canada? He, a British subject, has made practically the same suggestion which I propose to offer before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Our dealings with all nations must be on an equal basis. If Great Britain does not make settlement on a business basis of her accounts with us, every nation with which we do business will demand and is entitled to the same treatment. Such a course of action would bankrupt the United States. The Congress of the United States cannot afford to set up such standards in dealing with other nations.

RECONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me so that I may make a motion, with the understanding that the Senator will not be taken off the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the action taken by the Senate yesterday in confirming the nominations of approximately 350 colonels be reconsidered and that the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations be rescinded. The action confirming the nominations is to be found on page 971 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, February 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of why I have made the motion on which the Senate has just acted.

The War Department sent to the President a list of approximately 350 colonels together with the following memorandum:

JANUARY 31, 1946.

Memorandum for Col. Earl B. Wixey, G. S. C., Military Affairs Committee, United States Senate, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

1. The nominations for 349 lieutenant colonels to the grade of colonel, Regular Army, with rank from December 28, 1945, are being submitted to the Senate for confirmation.

2. These officers have completed 28 years' service and 5 years in-grade as required by law. These promotions are to fill existing vacancies, will not cause the limit of 1,054 colonels, authorized by law, to be exceeded and no officer is being promoted ahead of any officer senior to him on the promotion list. The law has been complied with in every respect. Those officers who are nominated subject to examination are so indicated in the nomination.

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

Mr. President, the list includes the name of an officer whose promotion has been questioned. It would be unwise for us to prejudge the officer, or to take any action which would affect him until after an investigation has been completed. Therefore, I am asking that the entire list be held in abeyance, because under the seniority rule and under the present law, not only this officer might be affected but others as well. The relative seniority status of those on the list will not be affected by the action the Senate has just taken, because when the promotions shall have been made, the service of each officer will be relative to a certain date under the action of confirmation. So no harm will be done to the officers who are to be promoted, and

yet the Senate will have an opportunity to determine if a certain officer should not be promoted, that he will not be promoted.

Mr. President, I trust that the President will be notified promptly of the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, with the understanding that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I had agreed to yield to another Senator.

Mr. HART. What I wish to say is on the same subject to which the Senator from Utah has just addressed himself.

Mr. ELLENDER. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a very important and much larger point is involved in the question now being raised. It applies not only to one officer but to the entire 349 whose names appear on the list. This promotion list means that more than one-third of the future Regular Army list of colonels is involved. Those are the men who will be commanding the regiments of our future Army. In any body of 349 officers there will be found varying degrees of efficiency, although all the officers under consideration have undergone a great deal of training and have performed satisfactory service for at least 28 years.

As the list came to the Military Affairs Committee the following fact was evident: Of the 349 officers whose names appear on the list, 92 had held under temporary appointment prior commissions either two or three grades higher, which meant that they had been selected upward as the best fitted for receiving promotion. Two hundred and forty-two of them had been temporary colonels, or had been selected for promotion of one grade, and 15 had remained as lieutenant colonels throughout the war. During the war a most important change was made which lay in the selection of officers for promotion to the temporary grades rather than strictly by seniority. Now, in all probability, there are differences existing within those three categories into which the list of 349 is divided. The service rendered by some of those officers during 4 years of war has, without doubt, proved them to be more competent than others of the same list.

Mr. President, there is yet another consideration. On the Army list, below these 349, are the names of other officers who held commissions won up to that of general officer, during this war. Of course, those men have not been considered for promotion to colonel although they have proven superior.

The Army has carried out the law of promotion by seniority. The 349 names were submitted to the President, and then to the Senate, because they were the names of 349 officers whose position was at the top of the list as the law required. Mr. President, I think the law is wrong. At this time, when the country has only recently completed 4 years of war, during which the entire list of Regular Army officers was tested to the limit, and when the stress upon them was much greater than ordinarily exists in time of

peace, what was learned about the respective qualities of those officers is being disregarded. During the war officers were temporarily promoted to higher grades by the selection of those who were judged to be of superior fitness for the tasks. Now, Mr. President, when there is much more to go upon in comparing officers and in picking out the best among them than has ever obtained before, we strike down the idea of promotion by selection of the best fitted and return to the principle of seniority promotions. I merely wish to be on record as expressing my belief that the law governing the matter should be changed as soon as it can be done.

APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE CHAIR
ON CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the appeal of Mr. BARKLEY from the decision of the Chair sustaining the point of order of Mr. RUSSELL that, under the rule, the presentation of the cloture motion on the FEPC bill was not in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield on the same conditions on which I have heretofore yielded.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed without impairment of the right of the Senator from Louisiana to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Maine is to speak, I think we should have a quorum present.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator does not desire it, I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I speak upon the pending measure because of my great desire that my colleagues may know the conclusions to which I have come, and more especially because I want the people of the State of Maine to know the convictions I have with respect to this entire controversial matter. I wish to make perfectly clear to all my colleagues now present that I am speaking in my individual capacity, and I absolve every Senator on the minority side from any responsibility whatsoever for what I may say.

Mr. President, the legislative and parliamentary situation in which the Senate is involved is contributed to by three related problems.

The bill itself, S. 101, raises in the minds of Senators the gravest doubts as to its constitutionality and its wisdom. It is significant that every voice in the Senate in behalf of the pending bill admits its serious defects and concedes that amendments should be adopted before approval is given to the measure. It is even more challenging that the proposed legislation faces the vigorous and bitter opposition of Senators who merit and who have the highest respect of all Members of this body.

Mr. President, many Senators charge that provisions of the bill go beyond and

are in violation of constitutional powers, of rights secured to our people by our American Bill of Rights and of the ethos of our people and institutions.

More specifically, Senators assert, first, that by this bill the citizen is subjected to unlawful search and seizure; second, that the citizen charged with an offense which, if proved, may subject him to the pains and penalties of fine and imprisonment, is denied the right of trial by a jury of his peers in the jurisdiction in which he lives or in which the offense alleged, and of which he is suspected, took place; third, that the proceedings against any individual may be initiated by an allegation, not in writing and not verified by either oath or affirmation; fourth, that a complaint may be filed against a person, not necessarily by the Commission, but by any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission; fifth, that the hearing upon the complaint is not necessarily to be before the Commission, but may be before the very agent or agency which filed the complaint, or any other agent, with no statutory and required qualifications; sixth, that this hearing may be held at any time or at any place in the United States; seventh, that should the person charged with offense be found guilty, the Commission shall state its findings of fact, shall issue a cease-and-desist order, and shall take such other affirmative actions—actions neither defined nor limited by the bill—as will effectuate the purposes of the act; eighth, that the Commission is given the authority to petition any circuit court of appeals, anywhere in the United States, for enforcement of the orders of the Commission, and that in this final and effective step in the enforcement of the Commission's findings such findings are conclusive upon the court, if supported, not by the weight or preponderance of evidence, but by any evidence at all; and ninth, that in this proceeding before the court, the respondent is given no right of representation by counsel, to present additional evidence, or to examine any person appearing before the court.

Mr. President, these charges are but some of the many leveled at the bill. If they are justified, they are an unanswerable indictment of the proposed legislation. I am persuaded of the substantial truth of these criticisms.

But these particular arguments do not stand alone, nor are they the most persuasive.

Mr. President, in most instances in which boards or commissions are established with regulatory and quasi-judicial powers, provision is made that they shall be bipartisan in person and character.

This is sound policy and right principle. It respects our idea of checks and balances in government. It assures expression of divergent views, and contributes to right determinations. In the pending bill this principle is completely repudiated, and instead of bipartisan-ship, section 5 permits all five members of the Commission to be of one race, one creed, one religion, one ancestry, one political party. I believe this possibility

challenges every principle asserted in behalf of the proposed legislation. If we are against the grant of such power, the reposing of such power in the Executive, why give it to the Executive?

Mr. President, the bill declares to be an offense that which, in the overwhelming number of cases, can never be proved. Who can know that I refuse to hire, that I discharge, or that I discriminate against any person, because of his race, or creed, color, origin, or ancestry? My motive is locked within my own mind, and, except in very rare instances, motive can never be proved.

The bill takes from the employer of America freedom to choose that man or that woman who in his judgment is best qualified to render service, to make contribution to the productive effort of America. It subjects the employer's right of employment of a person, and his business relationships with that employee, to the scrutiny and challenge of an agent of an autocratic government.

The bill declares its lost faith in the efforts of Christian generations to build a world of tolerance, of knowledge, of good will, and of brotherhood. It substitutes for the humane and kindly spirit of men the fear and the compulsion of law. Threat, dictation, compulsion of sword, or force of law have never aided man as he has struggled through the long centuries to make this a better and happier world for all mankind. This bill has not in it the sympathy and the warmth of the human heart. It must fail, therefore, of its professed purposes.

Finally, Mr. President, the bill creates another huge agency of a central Government which seeks always, and always exercises, restrictive and tyrannical powers over the social, financial, industrial, and political lives of a people. Here in America, warning of the loss of a people's freedom is seen all along the way we travel. Mr. President, these clear trends must be stopped if our America is to be saved.

Mr. President, the next two questions involved in our over-all problem are whether a filibuster is now being waged and, if it is, should cloture be invoked.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that a filibuster is in process. It is open, notorious, and continuous. The required reading of the Senate Journal, the amendments proposed to the Journal, the admissions and the threats of Senators, announce the purpose and admit the fact of filibuster.

I do not like a filibuster but, Mr. President, there can be greater evils in the Senate and in this country of ours. There may be times and circumstances in which minorities can in one way alone successfully resist the power of a temporary majority. Majorities do not have the right to exercise arbitrary and uncontrolled powers. I challenge contradiction of the assertion that through the long years, the framers of constitutions and the writers of law have been more concerned in the protection of individuals and minorities than in granting powers to majorities. Our own Bill of Rights, agreement upon which was a condition

precedent to the adoption of our Constitution, sought protection of the citizen and of minorities. Nine of its first 10 articles seeks to shield from the powers of Government and of majorities the freedom of the manhood and womanhood of our country.

These safeguards find authority in our fundamental law and in the rules of this body itself. Both recognize the fallibility of a temporary majority in matters of the highest import. This recognition requires a two-thirds vote, not a majority, to ratify a treaty. We require a two-thirds vote to convict in cases of impeachment. A two-thirds vote is required for the approval of a constitutional amendment by the Senate, and a three-fourths vote of the States is necessary for the ratification of the two-thirds vote of the House and Senate submitting the amendment, and no cloture can force the States to vote.

In the business life of our country, many instances are found in which more than a majority vote is essential to effect corporate changes.

In our civil and criminal law, subject to limited exceptions to the general rule, we demand not a two-thirds vote, not a three-quarters vote, but unanimity of jury finding in determining a civil controversy or for the conviction of the humblest person for even the theft of a paper of ins.

In all ordinary circumstances, we may safely rely upon majority rule in the life of our people and in our legislative processes, but Mr. President, there are occasions when we are forced, as in the present instance, to decide whether a filibuster by a minority is not a lesser wrong than the threatened action, through cloture's aid, of a majority. In my judgment, it is better in the cause of sound legislation and the happy relationships of all our people that the minority should have unrestricted opportunity to protect itself from the power of a majority than that they, the minority, should be subjected to the numbers of a majority.

Mr. President, for what I am about to say I am indebted to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who called my attention only a few days ago to the quotation I am now about to use, and, I hope, with his complete sanction.

Mr. President, Jefferson spoke a word of caution when he wrote in the preface of his *Manual of Parliamentary Practice*:

So the maxim is certainly true . . . that as it is always in the power of the majority by their numbers, to stop any improper measures on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary from time to time . . . by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check and which the wantonness of power—

The wantonness of power—
is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

Whatever may be the technical distinctions between a vote for cloture and a

vote for the bill, the hard, practical, and substantial truth is that a vote for cloture in the present instance is a vote for this FEPC bill and for its passage by a majority vote.

Mr. President, if I vote for cloture, in practical effect I give my approval to a bill unconstitutional and unwise. I give approval to a bill denying rights accorded to and inhering in every citizen of the Republic. I further, by such a vote, the cause of a bill which will result in disension, in strife, and in definite retreat along the roads of progress we heretofore have been slowly and often painfully advancing. I shall be building new and dangerous instruments of governmental power. I shall be strengthening the arms of government by weakening the liberties of the people of this blessed Republic.

Mr. President, because of all these considerations I have reached the conclusion that I cannot vote for this legislation. I cannot vote for a cloture petition which brings the evils of it closer to our country and our people.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield on the same condition as previously.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the people of my State commissioned me as a Senator I felt a great pride in the title of Senator. That pride is greatly enhanced by the privilege of being permitted to associate with men of the character and courage of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If I may be permitted to paraphrase some words of the Bard of Avon I would say:

His life is gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "There is a man!"

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] under the same conditions as I yielded previously.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to me by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, but I am glad to give way to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and to take the floor after they have concluded.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia under the same condition as I yielded previously.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, according to reports submitted by the agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, civilian employment in the Executive

branch of the Federal Government decreased 60,231 during the month of December 1945, from a total in November 1945 of 3,215,423 to a total in December 1945 of 3,155,192.

The reductions in the War and Navy Departments and in the national war agencies total 61,411, indicating that the peacetime departments and agencies actually had a net increase of more than 1,000 employees during the month.

Of the 22 establishments which added employees, Veterans' Administration increased 6,224; Post Office Department increased 2,625; Reconstruction Finance Corporation increased 2,522; Treasury Department increased 881; and Federal Works Agency increased 851. Other smaller increases are to be found in the Bureau of the Budget, Office of Alien Property Custodian, Office of Inter-American Affairs, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Smaller War Plants Corporation, Civil Aeronautics Board, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, Government Printing Office, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Archives, National Capital Housing Authority, National Labor Relations Board, Railroad Retirement Board, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Of the 32 agencies which decreased, the largest were War Department with a 52,933 decrease; Commerce Department with a 6,158 decrease; Navy Department with a 3,902 decrease; Office of Price Administration with a 2,570 decrease; Labor Department with a 2,070 decrease; Agriculture Department with a 1,455 decrease; and Civilian Production Administration with a 1,217 decrease.

With few exceptions, for some years, the agencies have been claiming credit for their part in the war effort with requests for additional employees to carry on their new activities. The average citizen was amazed at some of the fields invaded, but tolerated the situation in the belief that with the cessation of hostilities there would be a return to normalcy. However, one cannot help being alarmed at the course of events since VJ-day. The agencies are struggling to find reasons for the continuance of their supposedly temporary activities and in addition are anxious to absorb functions and personnel of other agencies which on the surface are reported to be in the process of liquidation.

Much of such reduction as is taking place is to be found in the shipyards and arsenals of the country. The industrial employees should not be the only ones removed from Federal pay rolls. Thousands of employees who found desk jobs in the Government as part of the war effort should be included in drastic reductions as the war functions in both war and peacetime agencies are curtailed and eliminated.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a table showing civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by departments and agencies for the months of November and December 1945, showing the increases and decreases in numbers of paid employees.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of November and December 1945, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Departments or agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (-)
	November	December	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget.....	741	753	+12
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS			
Agriculture Department.....	87,664	86,209	-1,455
Commerce Department.....	26,024	29,866	+3,842
Interior Department.....	43,397	43,135	-262
Justice Department.....	25,213	24,945	-268
Labor Department.....	34,596	32,526	-2,070
Navy Department.....	591,538	587,636	-3,902
Post Office Department.....	444,974	447,509	+2,535
State Department.....	18,943	18,864	-79
Treasury Department.....	94,762	95,643	+881
War Department.....	844,048	791,115	-52,933
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Civilian Production Administration.....	3,934	2,717	-1,217
Committee on Fair Employment Practice.....	55	30	-19
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....	600	602	+2
Office of Defense Transportation.....	374	243	-131
Office of Inter-American Affairs.....	602	605	+3
Office of Price Administration.....	40,034	37,464	-2,570
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	934	875	-59
Office of War Information.....	6	0	-6
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.....	608	642	+34
Petroleum Administration for War.....	281	190	-91
Selective Service System.....	17,043	16,561	-482
Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	1,684	1,792	+108
War Shipping Administration.....	5,045	5,044	-1
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	1	1	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	467	498	+31
Civil Service Commission.....	5,220	4,945	-275
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	546	543	-3
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	70	77	+7
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,477	1,469	-8
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,175	1,189	+14
Federal Power Commission.....	678	671	-7
Federal Security Agency.....	31,763	31,338	-425
Federal Trade Commission.....	430	477	+47
Federal Works Agency.....	20,503	21,354	+851
General Accounting Office.....	13,943	14,050	+107
Government Printing Office.....	7,031	7,111	+80
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,025	2,059	+34
Maritime Commission.....	8,019	8,283	+264
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	5,947	5,799	-148
National Archives.....	343	346	+3
National Capital Housing Authority.....	246	247	+1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	17	16	-1
National Gallery of Art.....	275	272	-3
National Housing Agency.....	14,380	14,241	-139
National Labor Relations Board.....	860	1,106	+246
National Mediation Board.....	100	95	-5
Panama Canal.....	31,580	30,624	-956
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1,650	1,715	+65
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	26,228	28,750	+2,522
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,164	1,172	+8

¹ Does not include employees stationed outside the continental United States.

² Terminated as of Dec. 31, 1945.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of November and December 1945, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Continued

Departments or agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (-)
	November	December	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Smithsonian Institution.....	419	417	-2
Tariff Commission.....	267	265	-2
Tax Court of the United States.....	122	122	-----
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	11,857	11,824	-33
Veterans' Administration.....	86,463	92,687	+6,224
Total.....	2,568,966	2,508,739	-74,046
Net decrease.....			+13,815
War Department.....	646,457	646,457	-----
Grand total.....	3,215,423	3,155,192	-60,231

³ Includes employees stationed outside the continental United States, except those of the War Department. Total for November, 106,924; and December, 98,955.

⁴ Employees stationed outside the continental United States, reported quarterly as of Sept. 30, 1945.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from attendance on the Senate from today until Friday, February 15, in order that I may make a trip to my home State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, leave is granted the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate tomorrow, for 1 day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave requested is granted.

ATOMIC BOMB AND AIRCRAFT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming on condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the subject of the atomic bomb test, which is to take place in the Pacific in May, is not a new one to this body.

But with your permission, Mr. President, I should like to venture a suggestion; indeed, I would make it a most urgent request. It is possible that my suggestion has already received consideration, but not to my knowledge.

During the month of May, 97 ships of the Navy will be anchored in a lagoon—sitting ducks—stripped of their greatest defensive weapon, the power of movement, the ability to disperse and take evasive action. On their decks will be the heavy, medium, and light guns; radar towers will be in place; lifeboats will be slung; observation planes will be on their ramps; while on the carriers, aircraft will be in position of readiness. Beneath the steel decks will be oil and aviation gasoline and bombs and rockets and heavy naval shells. On the islands about will be military installations—pill boxes, tents, dumps, and buildings. This we know.

Coupled with what we already know about the effect of the A-bomb, we hope

to gain much information. We know what it does to cities, and, therefore, what it can do to land armies. We will know, or we hope to know after this test, what it can, under certain conditions, do to surface craft.

In winning the war we used three forces—land, sea, and air. In this test we are hoping to prove something regarding sea power. We already have some information on the effect on land, but apparently we have no information, nor are we making any preparation to obtain information as to the effect of the atomic bomb on our air forces.

Perhaps plans have already been made to do this very thing. Perhaps my suggestion is late. I do not know.

But I do know that in all the newspaper publicity I have seen to date, and in all the discussions I have heard so far, the only reference to aircraft—other than a few tiny drones filled with recording devices—has been to those on the decks of the old carriers and on the adjacent islands.

What I would like to see would be squadrons, complete formations of radio-operated planes overhead, fighters, light bombers, medium bombers, heavy bombers, and superbombers, at altitudes from a few hundred feet to thirty or forty thousand feet.

I would like to see these planes combat-loaded with ammunition for their 30- and 50-caliber machine guns, their 20 mm. and their rockets, with varying gasoline loads, and with bombs, fuzed and ready, just as they would carry in seeking out an enemy task force or searching for a land target.

Today the Army is scrapping hundreds of B-17's, B-24's, B-28's, and small craft. A selected number of these, plus Army and Navy light bombers and fighters should be in the air.

Thus, after the bomb has exploded, after the smoke has cleared away, and that part of the earth has returned to normal, we would have a complete picture of what the atom bomb might do—not only when it is dropped on land targets or surface craft, but also if it were sent aloft to intercept the approach of an enemy air armada.

THE WHEAT PROBLEM

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas, on the condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as the President of the United States and other officers have stated so frequently in the public press, one of the most important questions, not only in the United States but in the world, is the volume of wheat available for domestic and international use.

The head of one of the important farm cooperatives in this country is Mr. M. W. Thatcher, of St. Paul, Minn., president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Those cooperatives will have a conference at Chicago tomorrow and the next day, to which have been invited the Secretary of Agriculture and his representatives, and the chairmen of the Agriculture Committees of both the Senate and the House.

Mr. Thatcher has sent me a long telegram in which he discusses a number of phases of the wheat situation which go to the heart of the problem. He brings up the question of whether or not farmers should be expected to sell their wheat at present ceiling prices in a period when prices of all kinds, including wages, are going up. The question presented is whether or not the OPA will hold the present ceiling prices on wheat through to the end of at least this crop year.

Another question presents itself. The farmer is being urged to sell the wheat he now has. Will he also be expected to sell the crop which he harvests this year? If so, he will have an income-tax situation in which he will pay upon a larger sum, because he will be disposing of two crops in 1 year.

Other questions of that type are presented and discussed by Mr. Thatcher in his long telegram. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the telegram which Mr. Thatcher, who is general manager of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, in addition to being president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, has sent to me.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 4, 1946.

CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

There is a wheat problem but not one that calls for bread rationing or for use of more wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on the United States Department of Agriculture's figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat. There will be a heavy spring wheat acreage. Allowing for a January disappearance of 89,000,000 bushels, we will need up to July 1 no more than 200,000,000 bushels for flour, and 50,000,000 bushels for spring wheat seedling and miscellaneous farm use. This would leave 350,000,000 bushels of present stocks for export, carry-over, and livestock feeding. It would be better to stop feeding wheat than to ask flour mills and bakeries and consumers to adapt themselves to a new product with all the changes necessary to make a straight run of flour using 85 percent of the wheat instead of the normal 72 percent. The public and the processors would resist these far-reaching changes. Farmers will move the wheat to town and sell it if they are given parity treatment. Farmers know that Congress is in doubt about extending the OPA price-control law. That makes farmers doubt that it is wise to sell wheat under present ceilings. Farmers know that on July 1 there will be a big increase in wheat prices, if Congress does not extend the OPA law for another year. Farmers have the same intelligence as business people who have been and are withholding merchandise for the much higher prices which they hope will be realized either through dropping of OPA or through making exceptions, as for example the steel industry. Farmers also know that with wage levels in the process of rising, eventually such increases will be reflected in a new and higher parity price which under law will force the OPA to lift present ceilings on all farm prices. From the standpoint of price, the farmer sees about every advantage in not marketing wheat now. He is not going to succumb alone

to any patriotic call when he sees the United States Steel Corp. and General Motors Corp. and others getting away with theirs. The farmer feels that all he has to do is wait. Another point, the farmer is accustomed to carrying an inventory of wheat on his farm. It is his ever-normal granary and his base money supply. Not for patriotism alone does he intend to market this year both his present inventory and also his new crop. He would then be compelled to pay a 2-year or double income tax. In brief, he is not a fool. He intends to be treated as well as other groups in the economy of the Nation, even if he is the most patriotic. He, as much as any other person, wants to see wheat shipped to the starving people in other parts of the world but the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives cannot honestly urge its wheat-producing members to market their wheat so long as the wheat farmer is at a disadvantage as regards ceilings and double taxation. If the farmer knew now what wheat ceiling prices would be until July 1, 1947, and if he could be relieved of double taxation from marketing two crops in the same year, and if he could be assured that he would not be subject to a third tax by the repeal of laws protecting his marketing cooperatives as advocated by the National Tax Equality Association then we would be on sound ground to ring the bell of patriotism and save the starving families abroad. Further, if all these economic disadvantages were corrected, there is still a transportation break-down, not only from lack of boxcars, but from disorganization on the railroads. Now the movement of cars just from the Dakotas to Minnesota frequently takes weeks. We want to emphasize that you can get wheat for export, without upsetting the operations of flour mills and bakeries or changing the food habits of consumers. If you act now on these three problems: First, Give us boxcars and transportation facilities that will work and move the wheat. Second, decide now, one way or the other, on the future of OPA and price ceilings for 1946-47. Third, protect the farmer against double and triple taxation. If and when these three needs are met, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the general farm organizations will advise farmers to move their wheat off the farms. People all over the Nation are now questioning the political integrity and economic sense of both the Congress and the administration. This problem of wheat is not in the hands of the millers or the bakers or the farmers. It is in the hands of the Congress and the administration. We have called a meeting of our grain cooperatives in Chicago on February 8 and 9, and have called officials from the United States Department of Agriculture to confer with us. We also are inviting through this wire the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to be with us in Chicago. Our National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is comprised of the Regional Grain Cooperatives from Ohio to the Pacific Northwest, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Its annual handle of grain is close to 400,000,000 bushels a year. Most of the farmers who own these cooperatives also are members of the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union or the Grange. Thus you can rest assured that you can have the solid mobilized support of agriculture to move the wheat that is needed if the Congress and the administration will move first.

Respectfully submitted,

M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation
of Grain Cooperatives.

GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee under the same terms as I have heretofore yielded.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to take notice of the recent criticism which has been directed at General Bradley, the head of the Veterans' Administration. I believe that this criticism is very unjust. I think it is extremely unfortunate that it comes from the source from which it comes, Mr. Stelle, of Illinois, the head of the American Legion. A few days ago he criticized General Bradley rather severely for what he termed neglect of duty, as I understand, for his failure to handle more expeditiously the claims of veterans of World War II.

General Bradley has been done a very grave injustice by this charge. It is quite true, and known by everyone to be true, that many thousands of claims of veterans who have been released from this war are piling up in the Veterans' Administration. For many reasons the Veterans' Administration has been unable to handle them as rapidly as it would like to handle them. General Bradley has expedited the handling of such claims as rapidly as any other man who might have served in his capacity, or who might now be serving in his capacity, could have done. I believe that he has done perhaps a great deal better than many other men might have been able to do.

We must remember that since General Bradley was appointed to head the Veterans' Administration more than 7,000,000 persons have been discharged from the armed services. As a result, many thousands of claims of various kinds have been filed. It has been humanly impossible to handle every one of them. General Bradley has been at the head of the Veterans' Administration for less than 6 months. In my opinion he has done as well as, or better than, almost anyone else who might have been serving in that capacity. I believe that the present criticism is extremely unfortunate, most untimely, and completely unjustified.

In my opinion there is not a man in the United States who is of greater stature than General Bradley. He was one of the great soldiers and leaders of the World War which has just recently been concluded. He was not only one of the great soldiers of this World War, but, as has been stated by those in a position to know, one of the greatest military tacticians of all time. He is a man of tremendous capabilities. He has not had one-tenth of 1 percent of the chance that he is entitled to in this work. He has made a far better showing than might have been expected of him under the circumstances.

As one Senator remarked to me a few moments ago when we were discussing the subject, perhaps public sentiment has already taken care of the matter. I think it is extremely unfortunate that this criticism should have been made. From the experience I have had and the contact I have had with General Bradley in the past 2 or 3 months, I know something of the magnitude of the work which he is required to do. Based upon the knowledge and information which I have, which I believe to be entirely accurate, I make the statement that this

charge is utterly unjustified. I do not know whether it falls in the category of cheap publicity or not, but it certainly is not and never has been justified.

General Bradley will make good as head of the Veterans' Administration. He is the kind of man who will see to it that his administration is successful. He is not only capable, but he is thoroughly honest, and he is painstaking in everything he does. The plans which he has for the future in behalf of the veterans are exceptionally broad and well-considered.

I repeat that the charge against General Bradley is not only unfortunate, but absolutely unjustified.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska under the same terms and conditions as I have heretofore yielded.

Mr. WHERRY. I accept the terms, so as not to prejudice the rights of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I thank him for his patience and also for giving me the opportunity at this time to submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to Senate Joint Resolution 118 amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the margin of profit which must be allowed in fixing maximum prices. I send the amendments to the desk, and I ask that they be read and referred to the appropriate committee. If there is any doubt, I also ask unanimous consent that hereafter Senate Joint Resolution 118 be Senate Joint Resolution 118 as amended by the proposed amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Without objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to Senate Joint Resolution 118 will be received, read, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and printed.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. WHERRY to Senate Joint Resolution 118 are to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States (a) that the achievement of maximum production in industry is essential to prompt and orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy, (b) that the necessity for obtaining maximum production in industry is paramount to the need for maintaining existing price levels, and (c) that the authority to establish and maintain maximum prices, conferred by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be exercised in a manner calculated to stimulate, secure, and maintain maximum production.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity under authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or otherwise,

(1) below a price which will reflect to producers, manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors, jobbers, and retailers dealing in such commodity a percentage profit per unit, based on current costs, equal to the average percentage profit per unit earned during the calendar years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, or (2) which will reduce or result in the reduction of trade discounts or percentage mark-ups, with respect to such commodity, below the average established trade discounts or percentage mark-ups applicable with respect to such commodity during such calendar years.

"(p) No regulation or order shall be promulgated or enforced under the authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or otherwise, which (1) establishes maximum prices in such a manner as to require absorption by the seller of a commodity of lawful increases in the costs of production, processing, or distribution of such commodity, or (2) directly or indirectly requires or compels a producer of a commodity to conform, during any period, to a pattern of production or sales of such commodity by price range or unit classification, based on any prior period."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. At any time after the issuance of any regulation or order under section 2, or in the case of a price schedule, at any time after the effective date thereof specified in section 206, any person subject to any provision of such regulation, order, or price schedule may file in the district court of the United States for the district in which he resides or maintains his principal place of business a petition praying that such regulation, order, or price schedule be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the Administrator, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enjoining or setting aside in whole or in part the regulation, order, or price schedule, or dismissing the petition. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals as in other cases, and the judgment and decree of such circuit court of appeals shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification, as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. Code, title 28, secs. 346 and 347)."

(b) Section 204 of such act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

And amend the title so as to read: "A joint resolution to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, so as to achieve maximum production, eliminate impediments thereto, created by certain policies, and for other purposes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to give the history of the formulation of the amendments which some of the members of the Small Business Committee are now offering to Senate Joint Resolution 118.

On November 15, 1945, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 118, proposing amendments to the Price Stabilization Act. That joint resolution provides as follows:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity under authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or otherwise, (1) below a price

which will reflect to producers, manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors, jobbers, and retailers dealing in such commodity a percentage profit per unit, based on current costs, equal to the average percentage profit per unit earned during the calendar years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, or (2) which will reduce or result in the reduction of trade discounts or percentage mark-ups, with respect to such commodity, below the average established trade discounts or percentage mark-ups applicable with respect to such commodity during such calendar years.

Those are the provisions of that short amendment to the act. In brief, the joint resolution would forbid the Office of Price Administration to put into effect a maximum price which would not reflect percentage-wise the mark-up enjoyed down through the years on top of current costs. It would also prohibit the Office of Price Administration from giving a percentage of a price payable under a private contract or an invoice to labor engaged in production or some other segment of the industry concerned, at the expense of a retailer or distributor or some other segment of the industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit, I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator, and I judge that he wishes to do away with the retail cost-absorption policy of the OPA.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say to the Senator that I agree that should be done. Does not the Senator think that the Office of Price Administration should be prohibited from placing on agricultural commodities price ceilings which do not reflect parity plus the labor costs?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say emphatically that I certainly do agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I am sure he will recall that not long ago I offered on the floor of the Senate an amendment, which was adopted, providing that the farmer should be paid on a cost-plus basis for the commodities he produced, just as in the case of payments made under the provisions of contracts relating to the sale of industrial products. Certainly a rule or regulation relating to the sale of agricultural commodities that does not result in the payment of parity is in direct contradiction to the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act itself.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Gladly, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to say that parity, as it is defined in that act, does not include farm-labor costs.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. When I now refer to parity, I mean parity on top of current costs. That would include the labor costs.

Mr. EASTLAND. For instance, today in the South the farm-labor costs amount to more than three times what they did during the base period.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. For that reason, when we include in our calculations the farm-labor costs, we find that today the

cotton growers cannot produce cotton at a profit.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. From what I understand of the farm-wage scale in the West, the situation is even more critical in the West than it is in the South.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it is.

Mr. EASTLAND. I state to the Senator that when the question of the renewal of the Price Stabilization Act comes before the Senate, I shall offer amendments along the line I have indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator. Let me say that I wish it to be understood that I believe parity should be based upon current costs. The old definition of parity is the relationship of the average price of the farm product during the years 1909 to 1914 to the relation of the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar for what the farmer buys. The Senator from Mississippi well knows, as do all of us in the Middle Western States, that today labor costs are in some cases three times what they were in 1909 and the relationship upon which parity is based is out of line.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. So, on the basis of today's costs, parity does not represent the cost of producing a commodity in the same relationship as back in 1909-14.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand the situation, farm-labor costs in the West are five times what they were in the period 1909-14, and in the South they are three and one-half times what they were in the period 1909-14. In the interest of doing justice to agriculture, Congress must rectify that situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, Mr. President, that matter must be considered when the question of the extension or renewal of the Price Stabilization Act is before the Senate, because I think all Senators agree that if we are to obtain maximum production we must make it possible for producers to make a profit, not only in the production of industrial articles but also in the production of farm commodities as well. That does not mean that there will have to be runaway inflation. That does not mean that the price stabilizer will not be able to fix ceilings which will control the selling prices of a particular product. But we would prevent the Price Stabilizer from fixing a price ceiling which would not permit the producer to make a profit. We believe steps should be taken to make sure that the producers will obtain profits, as well as to make sure there will be ample production.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so once more.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say that the Senator is correct in what he has said. Of course, what he has suggested will not cause inflation; but it will prevent inflation, because it will bring about production.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. After all, production is the only safeguard the people of the United States have against inflation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my theory, and it has been all the time. The first speech I made on the floor of the Senate—in 1943—was an appeal to the Senate to lift the restrictions so that maximum production might be obtained. Not only did we need it for our wartime economy, but, as I said then, and I now repeat, maximum production is the best weapon we can use in our fight to whip inflation. I say that in the battle to whip inflation, it is of paramount importance that production be obtained, rather than that prices be controlled.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. * Yes; if the Senator from Louisiana will again permit me to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, and I know that he agrees with me when I say that industrial labor is entitled to a higher wage scale. We agree that it should be properly paid. But the Office of Price Administration and its personnel are discriminating against American agriculture, and are doing so for the benefit of industrial labor. I do not think the average laboring man desires to see any American worker discriminated against.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him once again.

Mr. President, a moment ago I read the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 118, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and myself on November 15, 1945. I shall now proceed to state the foundation or basis upon which the new amendments, which were read by the clerk, are offered.

When the joint resolution was introduced I requested, should it be referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that the chairman of that committee assure the Members of the Senate early hearings would be held so that evidence might be adduced for immediate consideration, in connection with the President's proposal to extend the Price Stabilization Act for 1 year from its termination in June. I also requested that the amendments offered be considered in order to correct the slowing-down of production since VE-day.

Senators may recall that on the afternoon when I introduced the joint resolution, considerable colloquy took place between the Senator from Oregon and myself, as well as some of the other Senators on this side of the Chamber, and it was stated that it was necessary for the Banking and Currency Committee to conduct immediate hearings, because the price-control program was holding back production in almost all lines of industry. At that time some of us requested that hearings be held, and that a report be made to the Senate on the suggested amendments.

The chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has not seen fit to call hearings, although in a very few weeks the Members of the Senate will be called on to vote upon legislation for the extension of certain powers granted to the Executive at the outbreak of hostilities.

Those powers, as enacted in the Emergency Price Control Act, the Stabilization Act, and the War Powers Act, were extended from time to time during hostilities and are being exercised today. Moreover, their extension is being asked for.

Prior to, during, and since the Christmas vacation, members of the Small Business Committee have conducted hearings on the question of the exercise of these powers since VJ-day, and have studied the effect of their administration since the cessation of hostilities. We are convinced that changes must be made if we are to discharge our duties as legislators, and assist the rehabilitation of our Nation's economy. The report of the committee has not yet been made available. It is now being prepared, and I am hopeful that at least a majority of the Members will sign it, because I think that, in the main, at least so far as recommendations are concerned, our committee is pretty much in agreement. There may be controversy with regard to some of the basic problems involved, but so far as the recommendations are concerned, I think that nearly all members of the committee will agree. When offered, they will, no doubt, be offered by the chairman of the committee.

Our study of the subject was detailed and extensive. What we found will doubtless be of great interest to the Senate and will assist us all in the proper determination of this most important question.

I wish to stress the fact that this is not a partisan question, nor is it a matter for partisan consideration. The significance of the action that must be taken on the subject lies in its determination of the immediate destiny of our economy.

As a result of these studies, I am suggesting a proposed amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 118, which provides that it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States:

(a) That the achievement of maximum production in industry is essential to prompt and orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy.

(b) That the necessity for obtaining maximum production in industry is paramount to the need for maintaining existing price levels.

If it is necessary to increase the price level in order to obtain production, I think that question should be determined by the Congress so that those in authority will interpret the intent of Congress to the effect that the first and primary requisite is to obtain production, and that a price increase should not be held up continuously over a period of months until such a point is reached that producers will be put out of business.

(c) That the authority to establish and maintain maximum prices, conferred by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be exercised in a manner calculated to stimulate, secure, and maintain maximum production, including that of the farms.

Secondly, that section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as

amended, be amended by adding at the end thereof section (o), which includes the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 118. I have previously discussed that resolution. Moreover, the proposed amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 118 would include amendments to the Price Stabilization Act of 1942, which would prohibit:

First, establishing maximum prices in such a manner as to require absorption by the seller of a commodity of lawful increases in the costs of production, processing, or distribution of such commodity; or

Second, directly or indirectly requiring or compelling a producer of a commodity to conform, during any period, to a pattern of production or sales of such commodity by price range or unit classification, based on any prior period.

This would prohibit the continuance and extension of what is known as the cost-absorption policy now in effect under the Office of Price Administration.

Finally, section 203, a proposed amendment providing that at any time after the issuance of any regulation or order under section 2, or in connection with a price schedule, or at any time after the effective date thereof as specified in section 206, any person subject to any provision of such regulation, order, or price schedule may file in the district court of the United States for the district in which he resides or maintains his principal place of business, a petition praying that such regulation, order, or price schedule be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

Today no such right is enjoyed. The moment that a regulation is issued, its effect begins immediately. It cannot be set up as a defense. Moreover, if a person is indicted for a violation thereof, he may not go into the Federal court and obtain an injunction pending the determination by a judicial court, but he must comply with the price regulation. Under those conditions there have been cases in which persons have been compelled to wait for as long as 6 months, which resulted in their being driven out of business. Such a situation should not be allowed to continue. Upon filing such a petition, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the Administrator, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enjoining or setting aside in whole or in part the regulation, order, or price schedule, or dismissing the petition. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals as in other cases, and the judgment and decree of such circuit court of appeals shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

That means that after a price regulation has been issued, if one against whom the regulation applies has not seen it

within a 30-day period, he shall not lose his right to go into a Federal court and challenge the regulation. In all other cases the defendant has a right to his day in court. After the defendant gets into court I think that he should have the right to have an order entered by the court restraining the Price Control Administrator from carrying out the terms of the regulation until a judicial determination has been had. Furthermore, the defendant should be permitted to go into a Federal court of the district in which his business is located, instead of being required to come to the Emergency Court of Appeals in Washington and seek relief. No Member of Congress would wish to require a man to travel 1,500 or 2,000 miles, as some have been required to travel, in order to get into the Emergency Court of Appeals when he should have the right to take his case into the Federal court of the district in which his business is being conducted.

Mr. President, I have explained some of the amendments which some of us have found to be necessary. I ask unanimous consent that when the report is finally made by the Small Business Committee, inasmuch as no report has been made by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and no hearings have ever been held on the joint resolution which was introduced in November of last year, the Senate immediately start debating the question of whether or not we shall extend the Price Control Administration in accordance with the wishes of the President. We should become familiar with the problems to which I have referred, which are blocking production. Production is being curtailed because of the price-fixing policies of the administration which are causing the disruption of industry throughout the land. So if the price program extension is asked for, those of us who believe these things should be done will have an opportunity to amend the bill when it comes before the Senate; but if the amendments are not adopted, and the administration continues to interfere with maximum production, then I think we will have an absolute defense, and that we should no longer continue the Office of Price Administration.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the time he has given me to present my amendments and for other courtesies extended. I ask that the amendments be referred to the proper committee, and I assume they will be assigned to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I respectfully ask that consideration be given Senate Joint Resolution 118, and that the amendments proposed herein to Senate Joint Resolution 118 receive consideration at the same time.

RATIONING OF BREAD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield on the same terms and conditions on which I have yielded heretofore.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator. I assure him that I shall occupy the floor for only a very short time.

Mr. President, I dare say all Members of the Senate noticed the headlines in the newspapers today advising that the United States is to be on short rations in order to feed the world. Before proceeding further, I assure the Members of the Senate that I, for one, am just as much concerned as is anyone else in complying with all obligations which may rest upon us to distribute food elsewhere in the world where it is needed. But I think this is a question which should have the attention, closer attention than it has had to date, of the Members of Congress.

I presume all Senators have been receiving messages within the last few days from millers in their States and from large bakery operators, and perhaps some of the smaller ones, who are worried about having supplies with which to operate their plants. In order to bring this matter before the Senate, I shall read one typical message, which comes from one of the large baking concerns in Omaha, Nebr., dated the 6th of February, and addressed to me, as follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., February 6, 1946.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Highest levels of Government considering rationing wheat flour or down-grading flour and bakery products by permitting milling of only dark and coarse flours. Either proposal will reduce consumption of bread, the best and most nourishing energy food. Reduction of volume will require price relief to bakers and increase cost of living; down-grading means force feeding of Americans with coarse animal filler in the name and guise of wholesome energy foods. The human digestive system, unlike that of farm animals, is irritated by and cannot utilize the food values in coarser feeds milled into down-graded dark flour. The present acute animal feed situation would also be further aggravated by such proposed action. The English wartime trial of flour and bread down-grading caused consumer dissatisfaction, decline of bread consumption, and increased consumption of substitute foods of higher cost. We ask your cooperation in protecting the American human health and diet, in maintaining good wheat nourishment for human mouths instead of animal mouths and foreign mouths.

Mr. President, I think all will admit that there exists a wheat problem, but not one that calls for bread rationing, or for use of more wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on United States Department of Agriculture figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand at that time. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat. There will be a heavy spring acreage. Allowing for January disappearance of 89,000,000 bushels, we will need up to July 1 no more than 200,000,000 bushels for flour, and 50,000,000 bushels for spring wheat seeding and miscellaneous farm use. This would leave 350,000,000 bushels of present stocks for export, carry-over, and livestock feeding. It would be better to stop feeding wheat than to ask flour mills and bakeries and consumers to adapt themselves to a new

product, with all the changes necessary to make a straight run of flour, using 85 percent of the wheat instead of the normal 72 percent.

Late yesterday, before I knew of the Executive order of the President, I prepared a very short statement, which, with a very minor change, I intend to put into the RECORD today. I shall take the privilege of reading the statement into the RECORD at this time in order that others may have the inspiration, I hope, of informing themselves about this rather serious situation.

The following statement was prepared late last evening, February 6, before I had word that a statement was to be issued by the President, putting the United States on a dark-bread diet in order to feed Europe. The statement I prepared yesterday is still appropriate, in spite of the fact that the President has since issued his order. Therefore, I am going to leave it just as I prepared it yesterday.

Few persons realize that we are threatened with rationing of bread—the staff of life. During the last few weeks there has developed what appears to be a shortage of wheat for grinding. There is no real shortage of wheat in the United States. Department of Agriculture figures confirm that statement. Nevertheless, there is a move on within the regulatory departments to ration wheat to the millers, and also to require them to make more pounds of flour from a bushel of wheat. This means that part of what we ordinarily feed to the livestock—bran and shorts—is to be put in the flour sack for the housewife and the bakers to use in making bread.

Housewives do not know the threat as yet, but many of the big bakers over the country have had the tip-off and are beginning to speak out. No doubt many Members of Congress have already heard from them direct, as I have myself.

I sincerely hope no emergency war order will go out requiring this down-grading of flour for human consumption. If it does, I predict dire results—far from what the Government agencies expect. The English tried this experiment during the war, and with unsatisfactory results. Bread consumption declined, and the use of higher cost substitutes arose. The human digestive system, unlike that of farm animals, is irritated by and cannot utilize the food values in coarser feeds milled into down-graded dark flour.

Another excuse for this plan of down-grading wheat flour, is the shortage of boxcars for the shipment of the wheat to mills. The real reason, however, is that certain commitments have been made to ship wheat to the hungry in Europe and Asia. Millers in my own State of Nebraska, the geographical center of the United States, and the heart of the Wheat Belt, are concerned, and some have asked that we lower or eliminate entirely import charges on wheat from Canada, Australia, and the Argentine. My suggestion would be that we stop shipping our own wheat abroad, but fulfill our foreign obligations by purchasing wheat in Canada, Australia, and Argentine and ship it direct to the hungry in Europe and

Asia, instead of lowering our own stocks to the point where we may have to import into the United States for our own use. It would mean a tremendous saving in the unnecessary handling of supplies, and boxcars are really critically short. Just yesterday I had a request from one of the big milling companies that the railroads be required to furnish them open cars, that is, coal cars, commonly called gondola cars, for the shipment of wheat to the mills. Open cars are usually used only for shipment of coal or similar materials that do not require enclosed cars for safe handling. Millions of bushels of Nebraska wheat have already been moving to market in open cars, and if the railroads will furnish the equipment we can still ship our wheat, but if they will not, wheat for export cannot be shipped from the interior points of the country.

Late yesterday I sent the following telegram to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture:

Reports reach me that some consideration is being given plans looking toward changing regulations affecting the manufacture of wheat flour, requiring a higher percentage of the grain to be sold as human food. This is perhaps a suggestion made account apparent shortage of grain for milling and actual shortage of boxcars for shipping and partly due to desire on part of some who want to further regulate everything. There is no actual shortage of wheat. In fact, we have an abundance but there is a terrible shortage of boxcars. We produced planes, tanks, and other war material in abundance and could under pressure turn out an abundance of boxcars in a comparatively short time. We should stop use of available cars to move our own wheat into export and furnish the wheat to other countries from outside sources like Canada, Australia, and Argentina, thus insuring our own supplies both for human food and stock feed. I think those who plan this further unwise regulation of flour production should be stopped at once and the public advised that the American health and diet will be protected while at the same time filling our obligations to those of other countries from sources other than our domestic stocks. I hope you can wire me today that the American health and diet will be protected.

A few minutes ago I made inquiry from the proper sources in order to obtain information as to the amount of wheat available in the three countries I have named. There is not as much available in Australia as I had anticipated. In order that all may have the information, I shall put the figures into the RECORD at this point.

In Canada, as of January 1, there were available 238,000,000 bushels of wheat. Very little of it is required for domestic use. Practically all of it would be available for export. In Australia there were but 6,000,000 bushels available as of January 1. In the Argentine there are between two and three million metric tons of wheat that would be available for export to other countries.

Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the attempts of the administration to meet our obligations abroad, but I feel they have made a very unwise provision in adopting the plan they have chosen in order that those obligations may be met from our domestic stocks.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCRSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to refer very briefly to the comments on OPA made in the speech of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I do not share all the views expressed by the Senator, but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that some of the predictions made on the floor of the Senate as far back as June 8, 1945, as to the effect of the policies of OPA on the meat industry of this country have been fulfilled. It was stated by several of us last June that they would result in continued hardship, especially upon the small slaughterhouses, unless the Congress wrote into the law as of that time certain protective clauses which some of us felt essential if we were to protect especially the small slaughterhouse operators. The Senate will recall that at that time we were considering what was known as the Thomas amendment which sought to bring to an end the policy of the OPA respecting the so-called over-all plant profit principle. We sought by that amendment to see to it that there was written into the law protection for the small slaughtering-house operator so that he could have a profit upon the processing of the particular type of livestock he might be slaughtering as of any given time. It looked for a time, as I think Senators present will agree, that the so-called Thomas amendment would be adopted. Then an interesting bit of strategy on the part of the administration forces was brought into play. I refer to the letter of June 6, 1945, addressed to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] by the head of the OPA. There was much debate on that letter because it was argued that the letter showed the intent of OPA, and that it ought to be considered as a substitute, really, for the Thomas amendment. Over the protestations of some of us, that is exactly what the Senate did—it accepted the letter as a statement of OPA policy which could be depended upon in the future. I pointed out in my speech in opposition to the letter at that time, as set forth on pages 5788 and 5789 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 8, 1945, that there was a sleeper clause in the letter, that the letter was so framed and phrased that it gave the livestock producers and the slaughtering-house operators of the country no assurance whatsoever that the policies of OPA would be so administered as to result in that fair protection which we felt under the pricing policies of the Government they were entitled to. I say that because the letter contained this paragraph:

To the fullest practicable extent, the Office will see that each of these groups of products is separately profitable at all times, regardless of live-animal prices. It will at all events see that each group is separately profitable on an annual basis.

Mr. President, I raised serious question at the time as to whether that letter was even worth the paper it was written on, and I ventured the suggestion that it was not.

I will not take the time to repeat the argument I advanced at the time, but let the RECORD now show that on June 8, 1945, I not only proposed, but I argued somewhat at length that the only real guarantee we could give to the slaughterhouse operators and the producers of livestock was for the Senate to rise to what I considered its obligation and put into law the principle of the Bowles letter of June 6, 1945. I suggested that if Senators were willing to accept the Bowles letter, as it was being advanced by administration forces on the floor of the Senate, then they ought to be willing to clarify it and write that letter into the law.

Now exactly the predictions many of us made at that time have come to pass. We now find in the newspapers this morning the report of at least an interview with the chairman of the fact-finding board which has been called upon to find facts in regard to the wage issues in the packing industry. That interview reports that a fair wage cannot be paid on the basis of the profits which are being made by the packing industry because of the OPA price policy. Apparently if the wage that is going to be recommended by the fact-finding board is to be paid it is going to be necessary for the Government to take action either by way of subsidy or by way of price changes. We should have foreseen that, it seems to me, last June, and paved the way by enactment into legal principle of the remedy which ought to have been enacted at that time.

Mr. President, I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter to Mr. Bowles dated February 6, 1946, written to him by Mr. Wesley Hardenbergh, president of the American Meat Institute, which discusses at some length the situation which prevailed in the Senate on last June 8, and also discusses at some length the financial situation in which the packing industry finds itself. I should like to have the letter incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1946.
The Honorable CHESTER A. BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: During the hearings before the fact-finding board of the meat packing industry, representatives of the Office of Price Administration took the position that the meat-packing industry could absorb a substantial percentage of any wage increase that might be recommended by the Board.

The industry is surprised and greatly disturbed by this position of your representatives—

First, in view of the facts presented to the Board;

Second, as a matter of fairness to the meat-packing industry;

Third, on the basis of the Stabilization Act as amended in 1945; and

Fourth, because of past commitments of the Office of Price Administration which remain in effect and unsatisfied.

We contend that maximum wholesale prices on products resulting from the processing of cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs, the processing of each species being separately considered, have not over the past year allowed, and do not currently allow, for a reasonable margin of profit to the meat-processing industry as a group.

Under these circumstances, the meat-packing industry cannot, and must not, be expected to absorb any portion of any wage increases.

In support of our position, we respectfully call to your attention the following facts, legislative developments, and administrative actions relating to the meat-packing industry over the past several months:

Financial reports submitted by 78 companies, small, medium, and large, located in all parts of the country, equaling more than 67 percent of all federally inspected slaughter, show net profits (before taxes) per hundred-weight alive of only the following amounts:

For the fiscal year through October 1945:

	Cents
Cattle and calves.....	2
Hogs	4
Sheep and lambs.....	7

For the 4-month period July through October 1945:

	Cents
Cattle and calves.....	20
Hogs	30
Sheep and lambs.....	21

You will recall that the Price Control Act as originally enacted provided that maximum prices should be "generally fair and equitable," and an amendment to the Stabilization Act provided that "a generally fair and equitable margin should be allowed" for processing livestock products. The construction placed by the Office of Price Administration upon these provisions was that prices were "generally fair and equitable" and that "a generally fair and equitable margin was allowed for processing" if the current over-all industry earnings before Federal taxes equalled or exceeded the over-all industry earnings before Federal taxes during a base period 1936-39.

The regulations promulgated pursuant to this price policy placed controls both on the price of cattle and hogs and the price of products of livestock, and resulted, together with the tightening supply situation and increased costs, during the latter part of the fiscal year 1944 and for the several months thereafter, in a squeeze on the customary and necessary operating margins of the packing industry in the pork, beef, and lamb departments.

By January 1945, losses had become so severe that many meat packers were forced drastically to curtail or to suspend their operations.

These facts were well known to the Office of Price Administration through advice from its industry advisory committees, committees representing the industry, formal protests, complaints by many individual companies and testimony given before congressional committees. The existence of a scandalous widespread black market and the maldistribution of meat were a matter of common knowledge.

Notwithstanding full knowledge that its pricing policy was causing heavy losses on every animal slaughtered, thereby compelling law-abiding companies to curtail or suspend operations, the Office of Price Administration failed and refused to grant any relief, and, beginning in February 1945, committees of Congress made extensive investigations of the meat situation and published findings that the squeeze on meat processors was a factor contributing to the serious meat situation.

The Special Committee To Investigate Food Shortages for the House (the Anderson committee) recommended:

"We must therefore urge a fresh approach that guarantees these margins as a matter of right."

The Special Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry for the Senate recommended:

"That the Price Control Act be amended to require and direct the Office of Price Administration to give to processors of livestock a reasonable margin of profit for processing each species of livestock."

Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma proposed an amendment to the joint resolutions extending the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act designed to correct the faulty pricing policy of the OPA and prohibit the use of "the over-all industry profits test." The Thomas amendment would have made any maximum price unlawful for the products of any species of livestock that did not allow for the recovery of any processor's total costs plus a reasonable margin of profit not less than the profit earned in a representative base period.

The Office of Price Administration opposed any amendment and agreed to cure the defects and eliminate the causes administratively and on June 6, 1945, addressed the following letter to Senators THOMAS and McKELLAR:

"You have asked for a statement of the policy which the Office of Price Administration will follow in pricing the products of the various species of livestock.

"Recognizing the critical shortage of meat and the imperative need of avoiding any impediment to maximum production and even distribution, this Office, in addition to satisfying all the various mandatory requirements of the present law, will see that the products of each of the three main groups of livestock—cattle and calves, hogs, and lambs and sheep—are each separately considered, on a profitable basis.

"To the fullest practicable extent the Office will see that each of these groups of products is separately profitable at all times, regardless of live-animal prices. It will at all events see that each group is specially profitable on an annual basis.

"I have discussed this letter with Judge Vinson and Mr. Davis, and they authorize me to say they concur in it."

During the debate on the Thomas amendment in the Senate, the administration objected to the amendment on the grounds that (1) the Thomas amendment applied to all agricultural products whereas meat was the only commodity needing legislative relief, and (2) the Thomas amendment was impossible of administration because it would require the collection and analysis of the OPA of detailed figures from every company in the industry before wholesale ceiling prices could be established or changed and would require individual ceiling prices for each company.

Senator BARKLEY, the majority leader, offered a substitute amendment for the Thomas amendment, and it was enacted into law as the Barkley-Bates amendment.

When Senator BARKLEY offered his substitute amendment, he read your letter into the RECORD and said:

"Mr. President, a Member of the Senate has said, 'Why cannot that be integrated into the law. Why, instead of having a letter from Mr. Bowles saying he is going to do this, cannot we have it written into the law?'"

"I have undertaken to do that by means of a substitute which I now send to the desk and ask to have read. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5867).

In the course of debate Senator BARKLEY said:

"Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the amendment provides that each category shall be dealt

with separately. In other words, a maximum price would be fixed for sheep and lambs as though the producer were producing nothing else but sheep and lambs. Then a ceiling would be fixed on hogs, in dealing with that category separately as if the processor were dealing in that category only. Cattle and calves would be dealt with as a separate category, whether sold as steaks or veal. The purpose is not to put them all together in a sort of hodgepodge of meat.

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that basis, I do not think there is a great difference between the cost of production as between large producers and small producers.

"Mr. BARKLEY. The prices of the so-called Big Four or Big Five are determined on the basis of everything they made and everything they distribute; whereas if they were not making anything except the products of cattle, sheep, hogs, and so forth, their average unit profits might be no greater than that of the average small company that makes none of these extra things in his manufacturing process" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5868).

In the course of the debate Senator BARKLEY clearly indicated that the same margins should be allowed all processors, and said:

"Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, because, assuming that a reasonable profit margin is to be allowed to the processing industry—and I assume that that would be the case, because Mr. Bowles in his letter to the Senator from Oklahoma said that is the policy the OPA is going to inaugurate, and I am trying to integrate it into law—and that some of the processors will make profit enough to enable them to pay more for the livestock they process, automatically that will increase production.

"Mr. WHERRY. Then basically there is no difference between the Senator's amendment and the so-called Thomas amendment, except the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky applies to the processors in groups rather than as individuals. Am I correct?

"Mr. BARKLEY. It applies to the processors as an industry, as a group.

"Mr. WHERRY. Rather than as individuals.

"Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; rather than to each individual, for the reason I have attempted to outline. If it is applied to each individual, there cannot be any uniformity of prices in any community, and if the over-all is fixed high enough to reach the less efficient, the smaller man, it must be made so high that the big man will get more profit than he ought to have.

"Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, a Senator's vote probably will be determined, at least in part, by whether he thinks the OPA ought to deal with each individual processor and fix his profit separately, or with the industry of processing as a whole. There is one other difference. My amendment deals only with livestock and meat, whereas the pending amendment deals with cotton, textiles, etc." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, pp. 5868-5869).

It is clear that Congress intended by the enactment of the Barkley-Bates amendment, to prohibit the pricing policy theretofore followed by the OPA (the over-all profit theory) and prevent any further squeeze on meat-processing margins.

The meat-packing industry was entitled to assume that, from and after your assurances to Congress and the amendment of the law, any company with average costs and efficiency would be permitted to slaughter and process livestock and sell at maximum wholesale prices that would permit the recovery of all its costs, plus a reasonable margin of profits, for each separate species.

Notwithstanding numerous and widespread complaints that existing maximum prices failed to return a reasonable margin of profit by species on an industry basis, no relief was afforded until OPA Directive No. 90 was issued in December 1945.

On September 12, 1945, a joint committee representing the American Meat Institute and the National Independent Meat Packers Association called upon you at your office and furnished you with written proof that your commitment of June 6, 1945, to make the industry profitable by species on an annual basis had not been kept and that existing wholesale maximum prices were not in compliance with the law. You will recall that you assured the committee that you were aware of your commitment and the law and they would be met. You advised the committee that your office had collected figures from the industry, were studying them and retroactive relief would be announced on or about October 1, 1945.

I am sure that you will likewise recall that on October 25, when you appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in response to a question of Senator HICKENLOOPER concerning your letter of June 6 to Senator McKELLAR, you said, "That will be completely carried out," and further at the same hearing you assured Senator HICKENLOOPER that the provisions of the Barkley-Bates amendment would be complied with. You also said that the adjustment would be made in 2 or 3 days. (Hearing on controlling inflation before Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, pp. 46 and 47.)

On November 4, 1945, the Office of Price Administration announced to a subcommittee of its beef and pork industry advisory committees what it proposed to do in carrying out your commitment to Congress and to comply with the law. The subcommittee was informed the OPA was recommending that each company be paid additional subsidy for each species of livestock slaughtered from April 1 to October 31, 1945, as follows:

	Cents per hundredweight
Cattle and calves.....	10 to 12
Hogs.....	13 to 15
Sheep and lambs.....	20

and that the same amount per hundredweight was to be paid to each company, without discrimination, on an industry-wide basis.

We are informed that the subcommittee of the beef and pork OPA advisory committees promptly advised the Office of Price Administration that the proposed subsidy payments would be wholly inadequate to make the industry profitable by species for the fiscal year just ended or to provide a reasonable margin of profit by species for current and future operations. The results heretofore set forth confirm the joint committee's views.

Directive 90, issued on December 4, 1945, as a substitute for the OPA proposal, completely changed the OPA plan by (1) reducing the amounts to be paid, (2) setting up discriminatory eligibility provisions, (3) using "income from all sources" as a standard, (4) providing for individual pricing dependent upon eligibility, amounts of sales, and other factors.

Directive 90 does not follow the law or carry out your commitment to Congress; it revives practices and policies which were condemned by both the Senate and House and which led to the enactment of the Barkley-Bates amendment, namely, control of profits, over-all earnings as a basis for maximum prices, individual pricing which OPA claimed was administratively impossible for the purpose of defeating the Thomas amendment; in effect, the directive completely nullifies the Barkley-Bates amendment.

We are sure that you are thoroughly familiar with the fact that the widespread black market has continued to flourish and that it is in some respects more serious than found by the congressional committee in 1945.

You have been fully advised from time to time of the extremely serious situation in the cattle market and beef business. It is obvious that the prices being paid for good cattle

can only be explained by a very extensive and highly organized black market in beef and noncompliance with the cattle stabilization program. Legitimate operators have been compelled drastically to curtail their beef operations, thereby further increasing their unit costs. Unless conditions are promptly corrected, the beef business will largely be in the black market. In many consuming centers wholesale and retail ceiling prices are pure fiction and the price paid by consumers is far in excess of what prices would be if legal profit margins were adequate to permit their legitimate companies to again competitively conduct business.

We respectfully submit that wholesale meat prices and meat processing margins must be immediately increased and continued so that any company with average costs and efficiency can sell at legal wholesale prices and recover all of its costs, plus a reasonable margin of profits on each species of livestock.

We further request that you immediately review the position taken before the Fact Finding Board by your representatives on the question of absorbing any part of the wage increase recommended by the Board or finally placed into effect in the meat-packing industry.

Not only do we believe that any absorption would be contrary to the legal requirements and commitments of the Office of Price Administration, but we also believe it would do great harm to the legitimate operators and thereby accentuate your already serious problem of enforcing meat price ceilings.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,
WESLEY HARDENBERGH,

President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close my remarks by saying again that there are those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe that we must use price control during this abnormal reconversion period as one of the weapons with which to fight inflation. If we are not successful in the battle against inflation, then we may make up our minds to the fact that in the very near future, and I speak in terms of weeks, the lid is off, the American dollar will depreciate in value, and we will adopt by way of inflation an unconscionable repudiation policy in this country. A great many people with fixed incomes and a great many people whose savings are almost limited entirely to war bonds are going to find that their savings and bonds will greatly depreciate in value.

I happen to be one, as I have said over and over again, who believes that we will have to maintain, for at least 12 months, price control and restricted price policies on a good many commodities, especially those which involve principally necessities of life, and in regard to which there is a great scarcity. But I repeat that we must have an OPA policy which permits of adjustment quickly on the basis of the facts as they can be presented from time to time. That is why I am willing to join with the Senator from Nebraska and raise my voice once again for the resolution which has long been sleeping in the Committee on Banking and Currency calling for an investigation of OPA. The Senate has a responsibility to consider the resolution. The Senate ought to set up a Senate committee through which we can channelize the complaints and criticisms of OPA in order to sift the truth from what is false, and so that that committee can work as

a strengthening arm to OPA in those instances in which OPA is right. We need such a committee to be available to see to it that wrongs perpetrated by OPA, arbitrary practices of OPA, maladministration of OPA, incompetency which exists in OPA, shall be quickly brought to the attention of the Senate and adequate remedies put into effect.

Yes, I know that if one so much as speaks a word of criticism against OPA then there are pressure groups in America that say, "You are trying to destroy OPA." I repeat that in my judgment the real friends of OPA in the Senate of the United States, are those who have taken the position which the junior Senator from Oregon has taken many times on this floor, that we ought to set up, under the provisions of the resolution I submitted months ago, a senatorial investigating committee to find out what the facts are in regard to the administrative practices of OPA. Such a committee should be available at all times to protect OPA when it is right, when the facts warrant its protection. But certainly steps should be taken to remedy abuses when the facts of a case show that OPA is in error.

APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE CHAIR ON CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the appeal of Mr. BARKLEY from the decision of the Chair sustaining the point of order of Mr. RUSSELL that, under the rule, the presentation of the cloture motion on the FEPC bill was not in order.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BILBO. With that understanding, Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to present some matters, before further discussion of FEPC and kindred subjects has been closed in this debate.

Last week while speaking on this question the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] asked me the question:

At any rate, would the good Senator from Mississippi consider Monsignor Ryan, of the Catholic Church, to be a Communist because of his views in regard to this bill?

To which I replied:

When God has put His hand on a man, I take mine off. Monsignor Ryan is dead.

Then the Senator from New Mexico said:

Yes; God in His wisdom, works in a peculiar fashion.

I do not know whether the Senator knows Bishop Shelly; but would the good Senator from Mississippi, who is so broad-minded, say that Bishop Shelly, of the Catholic Church of Cleveland, or Archbishop Byrne, of the oldest Catholic diocese in the country, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., or Bishop Lucey, of the Catholic Church at San Antonio, are Communists? Would the Senator consider such persons to be Communists?

To which I replied:

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, if I did not think the Senator was high-minded and honorable, and did not possess any low traits of chil-

canery, I would think that his question indicated that he was trying to make a statement which the press could use in an attempt to show that BILBO was against the Catholics. I am not against the Catholics. Some Catholic priests in Mississippi are making the same fight that I am making.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator that that was not the purpose.

Mr. BILBO. Well, the Senator from New Mexico is a Catholic and he should know about the priests of the Catholic Church. So when the Senator from New Mexico gets the floor in his own right he can tell the Senate all about the Catholics and what they believe and what they stand for. I will take care of the Baptists and Methodists.

I started to say, "to my surprise," but that would be wrong, because I am not surprised at anything the Southern Conference for Human Welfare would do, because I know the character of those who are officers and managers of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare—

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield, provided the right of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the floor is not disturbed.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator does not imply by what he just stated, does he, that there is any difference in the patriotism or devotion to our country of those who may embrace one religion rather than another?

Mr. BILBO. Did the Senator hear me read from the RECORD?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I did not. I just entered the Chamber.

Mr. BILBO. That accounts for his question, which could not apply to the Senator from Mississippi. Certainly not.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator's answer would be informative to me, and I should like to know the answer.

Mr. BILBO. I have been associated with the Senator long enough to know that by this time he should know that at no time, under no circumstances, by direction or indirection, innuendo or insinuation, have I ever said that a man's religion had anything to do with his patriotism.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator very much, indeed, for that statement.

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to plant that thought in the Senator's mind, and I trust in the minds of the other citizens of our country.

After this colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico and myself I received the following letter from Meridian, Miss., dated February 2, 1946:

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: This afternoon I forwarded to you a letter I received from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, signed by its executive secretary, together with a separate plain sheet of paper containing the names of prominent church men and women in Mississippi and other Southern States which was enclosed with the letter referred to above. A few minutes ago Dr. Norman W. Cox, pastor of the First Baptist Church here—

That is, at Meridian, Miss.—

and president of the Mississippi Baptist Convention, called me and stated that a friend had advised him that his name appeared on the plain sheet of paper referred to above.

When I read the mimeographed sheet I was then confident that this organization enclosed the sheet to fraudulently represent that the persons whose names appeared

thereon were in sympathy with the movement to procure telegrams condemning you for your opposition to the Fair Employment Practices Act now pending before the Senate. Dr. Cox advised me over the telephone that he did not know his name was being circulated by this organization, that he was not in sympathy with the movement of that organization as was expressed in the letter to me, that he did not authorize his name to be used, and wanted me to show him what I had received in the mail. But I had already deposited the letter in the post office and it left by air mail this afternoon. By all means return the two pieces of paper to me when they have served their purpose so that I can show them to Dr. Cox. He is very anxious that this be done and, in justice to him, I am anxious also.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. ROSS.

By the way, Mr. Ross is a former sheriff of one of the largest counties in Mississippi.

I have before me a letter, a telegram, and other matters sent out by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, signed by James A. Dombrowski, executive secretary. The following letter is dated January 31. Senators will remember that the colloquy which I read awhile ago occurred on January 30.

NASHVILLE, TENN., January 31, 1946.

DEAR FRIEND: We are writing to ask you to join with other Methodist and Baptist ministers and laymen in signing the open telegram below to Senator BILBO. If you wish to have your name included, please send me a telegram collect. Simply say, "Use my name," and sign. Please give the correct name of your church or title if not given correctly on the attached list.

If you can secure one or two other signatures, we will welcome your help. It is important to hear from you at once. This telegram should be sent tomorrow night (Friday) or not later than Saturday.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. DOMBROWSKI,
Executive Secretary.

This is the telegram which the notorious secretary of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which I conclusively showed, in my 2-day address last week, to be a Communist-front organization, sent to me. If Senators have not had an opportunity to read my exposé of this miserable bunch of mongrels sponsored by the Communist Party, they ought to read it.

This is the telegram:

We, the undersigned Baptist and Methodist ministers and laymen—

Dombrowski prepared the telegram for the preachers to sign, condemning BILBO. That was a part of his scheme.

We, the undersigned Baptist and Methodist ministers and laymen, working for the removal of the slavery of intolerance, prejudice, and economic discrimination, resent your assuming the right to speak for Baptists and Methodists of the South, as reported in the press of January 31: "I will take care of these Baptists and Methodists."

Mr. President, there is no intimation or suggestion in anything I said in the colloquy with my distinguished and beloved friend from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to indicate that I was assuming to speak for the Methodists or Baptists of the South or of my State. There might be an intimation that I might speak about the Methodists and about the Baptists, but most certainly I was

not intimating that I was assuming the right to speak for the Baptists or for the Methodists. Sometimes it is necessary to talk about some of them, but certainly I would not be audacious enough to try to assume the right to speak for them. I shall select the individuals about whom I wish to speak.

By resorting to the unprincipled method of the filibuster in your assault upon the fair employment practice bill—

Mark that. This man Dombrowski, who is representing the Communist Party in the South, in the Communist-Front Southern Conference for Human Welfare, is trying to put in the mouths of Methodist and Baptist preachers whom he can induce to sign the telegram, the statement that filibustering is an unprincipled method, when it was shown in the speech which I delivered last week on the history of filibustering, that filibustering has been engaged in by Members of the United States Senate since 1790. From time to time through the years in this great forum, the greatest in the world, where unlimited debate has been permitted—even without cloture until 1917—from the year 1806 up until the present it has become necessary for the minority on this floor, representing sovereign States of the American Union, to defend the rights of their constituents, the rights of their sovereignties, by resorting to extended remarks, sometimes called filibustering. Yet this miserable creature wishes to make these men of God say that filibustering is an unprincipled method. It has been recognized and honored by the great men of this body in the days gone by. The records show that every filibuster which has been successfully conducted has resulted in great good to this Republic.

Today we heard possibly one of the best speeches of this session of Congress from the minority leader on the Republican side [Mr. WHITE] denouncing cloture as a method of curtailing or limiting discussion of any issue which comes before this distinguished body.

I continue to read from the telegram:

You and your associates have formed an unholy compact to delay the coming of social progress in the South and the coming of a world of brotherhood, peace, and democracy.

What Dombrowski means is just what every other Communist means. When he speaks about the coming of a world brotherhood, he is speaking about the coming of social equality between the Negroes and the whites in this country, miscegenation, mongrelization, intermarriage, interbreeding, doing away with white and blacks and making them all yellow. That is what he is talking about. That is the social progress which this "unholy compact" is delaying. I pray God that we may have strength enough always to delay it. I hope we can continue until this question is settled right and this Republic is saved from the day when all its citizens will be yellow and this will be a country of mongrels, mulattoes, and half-breeds.

I continue to read from the telegram:

We wish to remind you that the punishment assigned to that evil servant who said in his heart, "My Lord delayeth His coming," and began to smite his fellow servants, was

that he should be cut asunder and his portion assigned with the hypocrites.

This is more of the telegram which Dombrowski prepared for the preachers to sign:

The day is at hand when political punishments of this sort will be meted out in the new South—

The new South! Their idea of the new South is a South where social equality of the Negro will be permitted and the 10,000,000 Negroes in the South will become part and parcel of the social life of the South—intermingling, interbreeding, intermarrying, mongrelizing! That is the "new South" they talk about.

I continue to read from the telegram:

To its reactionary representatives who with their faces turned backward are engaged in smiting their fellow servants. It is inevitable that conditions of justice, tolerance, and equality be created.

That is the telegram.

To that telegram is attached a list of signatures of preachers in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, and Virginia. They are only a few of the preachers to whom the telegram which I have just read was sent. Dombrowski sent it to 22 preachers and leading laymen of the different churches in Mississippi. After he had gone to the expense of trying to have that telegram, which is filled with misrepresentations, signed by the preachers, all in an effort to condemn me for what I said in the colloquy to which I have referred, when I said I would take care of any Methodist or Baptist preachers who went haywire on this question or any other question, although I did not assume the right to speak for them, here are the ones out of the group of 22 in Mississippi to whom he sent the telegram who actually agreed to have their names attached to it as signers: Let me say that the ones who replied in that way are rather limited in number. He heard from Mrs. W. H. Ratliff, of the Southeastern Jurisdictional Council of the Methodist Church, at Clarksdale. She is the same lady who signed a bunch of telegrams or petitions which were circulated in the press gallery and sent to each Member of Congress last week. The same lady signed the telegram which was sent to her by Dombrowski. In other words, she puts her "John Hancock" on anything that Dombrowski sends to her to sign.

Another person who agreed to let his name be used as a signer of the telegram was Rev. Stewart Smith, of Vicksburg. He is the son of Joseph A. Smith, and is a nephew of Lillian Smith, who wrote that book of all books, *Strange Fruit*, that glorification of a love affair between a Negro woman and a profligate white man in the South. That book has received widespread condemnation in the severest terms. Mr. President, let me point out, for instance, that the good people of Massachusetts, with their excellent taste and sense of the proprieties, scorned that book; and the Supreme Court of that State denounced the book in the strongest terms saying that it was lascivious, demoralizing, and disgraceful.

As I have said, Rev. Stewart Smith is the nephew of the lady who wrote that book.

Another one who agreed to have his name used as a signer of the telegram is Rev. Walter L. Russell, president of Wood Junior College, at Mathiston, Miss.; and the telegram is also signed by Dr. Jasper Weber, president emeritus, Wood Junior College; and Dr. H. M. Williamson, dean of Wood Junior College. All those gentlemen are from Mathiston, Miss. Wood Junior College happens to be a little school which was established by northern capital right after the reconstruction days. It has been operating in a country district of my State. At one time I delivered an address at the commencement exercises at the school. It is a fine little school, but it has teachers who have been imported from the North, in order to inculcate into the minds of the young people of that section of the State the ideals and beliefs of the northern people. The three persons whose names I last read agreed to have their names added to the telegram as signers.

Another signer is Rev. Joseph A. Smith, of the Centenary Methodist Church, at McComb. He is a brother of Lillian Smith, to whom I have previously referred.

Another signer is the Reverend James S. Conner, of Leavell Woods Methodist Church, at Jackson, Miss. He is a newcomer to me, I do not know him. Another signer is Mrs. L. W. Alford, of McComb, Miss. She denounced me as well as my colleagues who have seen fit to oppose this unthinkable piece of legislation.

Mr. President, in the meantime, I have received the following telegram:

MERIDIAN, MISS., February 2, 1946.
United States Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Use of my name by Dombrowski totally unauthorized. You will find it in material of letter you will receive from Fred Ross. I do not belong to nor do I approve of the Southern Conference of Human Welfare program. I am totally opposed to the fair employment practice proposal and approve of your stand.
NORMAN W. COX.

By the way, he is the head of the Baptist State Convention of my State.

So, Mr. President, we find that when Dombrowski sent out the telegram which he had concocted, he attempted to leave with those who received it the impression that all the persons whose names were on the list attached to it would actually sign the telegram condemning Bilbo and his 25 or 30 colleagues in the Senate who are fighting this damnable piece of legislation.

In the meantime, Mr. Ross, who had received this junk from Dombrowski, sent me a telegram; he could not wait. His telegram reads as follows:

MERIDIAN, MISS., February 2, 1946.
Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I have sent the following telegram to James A. Dambrowski, secretary, Southern Conference, Human Welfare, Nashville, Tenn. "Regarding your letter of January 31, this is to advise you that you are doing more to reelect THEODORE G. BILBO to the United States Senate, by an overwhelming majority, than any other single organization, with the possible exception of the Communist front op-

erating in New York, Washington, and Moscow.

"The people of Mississippi are not as stupid as you apparently think. Your letter is being forwarded to Senator Bilbo, with the request that he incorporate it into the Journal of the United States Senate so that the American people will know the method of you and your group to promote racial distrust and hatred in the United States."

FRED A. ROSS.

Entirely in line with the idea which is expressed in that telegram—namely, that all this dirt and mud being dished out by my Communist friends is just a help to me, not a hindrance—I wish to read a little editorial from the Decatur, (Ala.) Daily News:

BILBO OR ELSE

If you lived in Mississippi would you vote for reelection of Senator Bilbo this year? Now wait, before you answer. When Walter Winchell, the PAC, the FEPC, the NAFAOFCP, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and groups like that tell you not to vote for a man, isn't your reaction pretty apt to be what the reaction of the people of Mississippi is apt to be come election day?

Mr. President, it has been rumored that the PAC, the CIO, and some of the other minority groups in the North are going to spend several hundred thousand dollars or a million dollars or so in Mississippi between now and the 2d of July to accomplish my defeat. I have just this to say: I have already organized in Mississippi. Let them send down the million dollars to accomplish my defeat. My friends are ready to receive it. We will take the money, give it a bath to get the taint off of it, then spend it for useful things, and then all vote for Bilbo. That is the way we will work with it.

In that connection, I wish to read a letter which I have just received from Mississippi. It will give some idea of just what is the attitude of the people of Mississippi:

JACKSON, MISS., January 24, 1946.

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO,

United States Senator (Mississippi),
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend your fight against the vicious and dangerous FEPC bill.

We continue to support your general racial outlook. We believe in what you believe in, and you can depend on us for everything from a vote or a letter to a fight.

The present apathy existing in the Nation, as well as in the South, concerning the importance of a racial viewpoint, is as alarming to us as undoubtedly it must be to you. Unless something is done to take the aggressive and carry the war into Africa, so to speak, the Nation is doomed beyond hope of recovery. The mere force of inertia and traditional custom will not be sufficient to turn back the tide. A dynamic faith is necessary to fight a dynamic, if sinister, faith. This is God's truth; and we wish we could say it to those who need to hear it a great deal more than you.

Even if you succeed in sidetracking this bill temporarily, and do not institute a countermovement against these diabolical forces, we will deserve the fate which will inevitably overtake us.

Frankly it is our opinion that we should resist by arms if necessary any attempt of this illegal commission to enforce a communistic tyranny on the Nation. We know that the vast bulk of the American people actually stand with all of us, but for some unaccountable reason remain impotent and

supine under the total domination of an unscrupulous minority.

We intend to vote for you, for we love you for the enemies you have made. We hope you will take your gloves off, and tell the people of Mississippi what it is all about in the next election.

Sincerely yours.

At this point I wish to read a letter dated January 24, sent to me from New York:

It is with great interest that I a southerner, stationed up here in Yankee country, read of your fight along with the other Senators, in opposition to the FEPC.

Keep up the good fight. A lot of us officers and soldiers are in sympathy with the opposition to that scandalous legislation. Although the northern Senators say that their voting populace is for the bill, I have heard many citizens of this small town in New York express opposition and furthermore state they will defeat Dewey and other Republicans for sponsoring that type of bill in the New York Senate and House last session.

I spent a period of 6 months in Mississippi down at Kiln, Miss., in charge of a CCC camp way back in 1935. I rode through Poplarville many times and have seen your home there. I also have seen some of the things you did for Mississippi while Governor. The problems concerning race are many in your State and if some of these dumb people would pay a visit there and see for themselves, a lot of this castigating would stop. My home is now in Virginia, and naturally am biased for the South, but I feel I am cosmopolitan enough to know a pressure group when I smell one, and that is just what you Senators are facing today. Keep up your courage, Senator, for you have many supporters who have not expressed a feeling as yet.

I expressed my feeling to Senator EASTLAND back in the summer when he so gallantly exposed the failure and cowardice of the Negro soldier. He was absolutely right. Again I say, success to you in this fight.

Mr. President, the writer of the letter which I have just read is a captain in the Army, whose name I cannot reveal.

I have recently received from Tsingtao, China, a letter dated January 22, 1946, bearing the signatures of approximately 65 marines. About 15 of the 48 States of the Union are represented in this letter. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: We have been following you in your great fight against the FEPC ever since this black piece of legislation was introduced into the Senate, and we got so darned mad at the continued attacks upon you by such magazines as Life and Time—

I believe those magazines are controlled by Mr. Henry Luce, the husband of Mrs. LUCE, a Member of the United States House of Representatives—

that we decided to write you just how we feel about the whole thing.

If the people in certain States want to live with the Negro, let them do it. That's democracy, but for heaven's sake why can't they let the other people in the United States who feel different alone. In our estimation this FEPC is the most damnable piece of legislation that has been introduced in Congress in 80 years, and we want you to know that we are 100 percent behind you in your fight to defeat the FEPC, and always will be.

As I have already said, this letter is signed by about 65 marines. They are from New Jersey, Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, Pennsylvania, Alabama, West Virginia, North Carolina—O, Mr. President,

there are about 15 States from which these marines came.

Keep up the fight and never give up. We, the undersigned, are 100 percent with you in wishing you an early victory over the FEPC.

I read the postscript to the letter:

The above-named marines didn't fight for anything that even smelled like the FEPC, and I know not one of their buddies died for anything that smelled like it. Show this to some of your fellow Senators if they think the servicemen favors it.

Mr. President, I am indebted to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who has been kind and courteous to me. I wish to read one more letter. It comes from Atlanta, Ga., and reads as follows:

I am in an office with eight other people and they have asked me to write you this letter. Due to the circumstances surrounding our employment, we are not signing this letter.

We want to thank you for your vigorous fight against this vicious and un-American FEPC Act. Regardless of the statement of Clark Forman, the head of the Southern Society for Human Welfare, Senator GEORGE represents the sentiment—the overwhelming sentiment—of the people not only of Georgia but of the entire South. This Society for Human Welfare recently lowered itself still further by bringing a Negro woman, who styles herself "Dr. Bethune," down here to tell us how we ought to treat the Negro problem in the South.

As to this petition signed by 3,600 southern people to do away with filibustering, when you consider that they probably honeycombed the entire South, and after weeks of laborious effort were able to secure only that relatively small number, I don't think anyone need give such a petition such attention.

Mr. President, last week I explained that about 4 months were required in order to get the petition into shape so as to be sent to Members of the Senate.

This bunch of fatheads are now doing nothing in the world but seeking to bring about social equality in the South. This crowd of renegade southerners might as well realize that if the FEPC is enacted into law it is going to cause race riots all over the South.

Mr. President, we all know that. Senators from the North do not appreciate the fact when we tell it to them. We have been born and reared among Negroes and we know the customs and sentiments of the South, both among the Negroes and among the whites. I was for 8 years the Governor of Mississippi, and God knows I ought to know what I am talking about. Regardless of the fact that I was Governor, the Negroes of Mississippi are my friends because I have always treated them fairly. As individual citizens they have their rights, but they are not entitled to social equality with the whites. We object to social equality because we have some regard for the integrity of white blood, and we know that social equality leads to miscegenation, which in turn leads to social equality in marriage, which in turn leads to mongrelization of the race.

I continue reading from the letter.

Every southern governor, including even Georgia's Little Boy Blue, has recently condemned the FEPC, and so has Mayor Hartsfield of Atlanta.

Keep up your fight and accept absolutely no compromise. The South is almost solidly

behind you. If you seek a compromise it will only mean you have got to go through another fight on the vicious bill at every future session of Congress.

We are sending copies of this letter to some of the more or less prominent gang who signed this petition to invoke cloture.

Yours truly,

NINE RED-BLOODED GEORGIANS.

I may say to the Senate that the authors of the letter need not urge us to keep up the fight, because this fight, like Tennyson's brook, is going to continue forever. We are fighting for principles, for our constituencies, for the sovereignty of our States, and the integrity of the blood of the Caucasian race. We shall continue to fight, and we want our opponents to know that we will keep up the fight until the proponents of the pending measure—or, I should say, the sponsors of the pending measure—who come here to administer drinks of stimulants to those each day who are sponsoring the bill, are convinced that their fight is lost. We will fight on until the sponsors on bended knee pray, "Please, O Southerners, quit blowing that hot air on us." [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me with the understanding that he will not be taken off the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is not often that I disagree with my distinguished colleague from the State of Maine [Mr. WHITE], for whom I have the highest admiration and greatest respect. But on the question of cloture and the advisability of it, I must disagree with him today.

I have recently returned, as a member of the Mead—former Truman—committee, from a 30,000-mile trip by air around the world. During the trip I saw conditions existing in the Far East. Once again I had an opportunity to see conditions which exist in Europe where I had served as a member of the Army for 18 months. No man can return home after seeing the conditions which prevail in Europe and in Asia without realizing that the coming of VJ-day and VE-day did not bring a solution to the great problems which face the American people and the people of the world.

I returned to this country convinced that anything which I could do to uphold the United Nations Organization and the establishment of a firm system of international law and order should be done. I am convinced that civilization as we know it cannot survive another world war.

We returned to the United States and found serious domestic problems facing the people of our country. Those problems affect the productivity of the Nation and involve conditions which may lead us into a great spiral of inflation which would wipe out the life savings of many of our people. We returned and found that the Senate of the United States had been tied up since January 17 with a filibuster which was preventing the Senate from conducting the public's business.

I cannot help believing that this is a good deal like a sit-down strike. I cannot help believing that the action of our

colleagues on the other side of the Chamber in conducting this filibuster is as effective against the legislative processes of government as would be a mass picket line marching up and down in front of the doors of this Chamber.

I believe, Mr. President, that 1946 may well indeed be the year of decision for the American people. I believe that as Senators of the United States we have a grave obligation to the people of our Nation and to the people of the world who are looking to America for world leadership, a grave obligation to show to them that representative government, as such, can function, and that it can function better than any other form of government in the world.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the demonstration which has been conducted here since the 17th of January would give any confidence to those who believe in representative government in this country, or who believe in representative government abroad, and are looking to the example of America. I do not believe we have given them anything which can make them confident that our form of government is better than their forms of government.

We have just emerged from a great world war in which representative government and constitutional institutions were challenged by those who believed that some form of statism was a better form of government than representative democracy as we know it, and with a great sacrifice of life and a great expenditure of wealth we came through that war and were victorious. Yet, Mr. President, at this time we find the processes of government stifled, we find the hands of the greatest legislative body on the face of the earth tied so that it cannot function, so that it cannot carry on and meet the serious legislative problems which are already facing this body.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I signed the cloture petition, and I shall support the motion for cloture on this and any other issue when a minority of this body seeks to prevent the representatives of the people of the United States from functioning under our due obligations. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The galleries will remain quiet. The occupants of the galleries are here as guests of the Senate. There will be no demonstration either of approval or disapproval of anything uttered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very glad to relinquish much of my time today in order to give to my colleagues an opportunity to speak, but I freely confess that I think I made a very serious mistake. Perhaps I should have given my time only piecemeal, so that I could have in the Senate Chamber a few more Senators to listen to what I have to say. As the Presiding Officer will notice, there are but two Senators present on the floor of the Senate besides myself.

Yesterday during the course of my remarks I spent about 4 hours on the introductory part of the speech I am about to deliver. When the Senate recessed yesterday afternoon I was submitting to

my colleagues some facts and figures relating to the number of Negroes and whites incarcerated in the State and Federal prisons and reformatories, and attempting to compare the number who were incarcerated in prisons and reformatories in the South with those incarcerated in the North.

In giving the figures I propose to present this afternoon I wish to say that I am not animated by any feeling of hatred or malice or animosity toward the colored people. I have lived among them all my life, and I know they are good people and are well treated. I know from my own experience that we of the South have treated the colored people well; we love them; but we do not associate with them to the extent of putting them on the same social basis with the white people.

As I stated yesterday, the Senate had better take heed of conditions which have prevailed in other countries which have placed colored people and members of the yellow race and the red race on a plane of social equality with the white people.

I cited the example of Brazil. I presented the example of Egypt and India, to show historically that the mixture of the white race with the colored or with the yellow has produced a mongrel race, and as a result progress has been stymied.

I shall not devote any time this afternoon to that subject, as I propose to take it up about Monday or Tuesday of next week, but I shall continue to give figures showing the number, respectively, of white and colored prisoners confined in State and Federal prisons and reformatories for the year 1936, and contrast the figures between the North and the South.

My purpose in placing these figures before the Senate and the country is to show, so far as I can, that although there are in the South three-fourths of the Negro population of the country, in contrast with the number in the North, yet among the colored people of the North more crime is committed than among the colored population of the South.

I indicated yesterday, the figures for 1934-35. I shall now give the figures for 1936, which indicate the number of prisoners received in State and Federal prisons and reformatories for the entire year.

In 10 Southern States—3 States did not report—the number of prisoners aggregated 6,886, out of a total colored population of 5,779,958, or at the rate of 12 to 10,000 of population.

In the 35 remaining States, with a population of 3,085,508 colored people, the prisoners incarcerated in State and Federal prisons aggregated 8,592, in contrast with 6,886 in the South. On the basis of 10,000 population, the figures for the Southern States show the rate to be 12 as against 23 for the 35 remaining States.

In the 10 Southern States, with a population of 19,611,562, there were 9,339 white persons incarcerated in the State and Federal prisons and reformatories as against 35,369 white persons incarcerated in the remaining States, with a population of 84,718,040.

I give the rate per 10,000 of population. In the 10 Southern States the rate of white persons incarcerated was

4.8, in contrast with the rate in the remaining States of 4.2. I call particular attention to how close the percentage rates are of white persons incarcerated in prisons and reformatories in the 10 Southern States compared with those incarcerated in the remaining States. Then I contrast that with the percentage rate for colored persons incarcerated, which was 12 per 10,000 in the Southern States as against 28 in the remaining States.

Mr. President, I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prisoners received in State and Federal prisons and reformatories, 1936

	Number of prisoners ¹	Total population ²	Rate per 10,000
Negroes:			
10 Southern States ³ (3 Southern States not reporting)	6,886	5,779,558	12
35 remaining States and District of Columbia	8,592	3,085,508	28
Whites:			
10 Southern States	9,339	19,611,562	4.8
35 remaining States and District of Columbia	35,369	84,718,040	4.2

¹ Based on report prepared by U. S. Bureau of the Census.

² Population figures based on 1930 census.

³ Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, I shall cite crime figures to show the contrast between cities throughout the country, and to make a comparison between some cities of the North and some cities of the South. I am sorry I could not obtain a complete recapitulation of all crime figures for all the larger southern cities and all the larger northern cities, but I think I have sufficient crime figures to demonstrate that the same discrepancy that exists between the number of colored persons incarcerated in prisons in the South in contrast with the number of colored persons incarcerated in prisons in the North prevails, but that in fact the difference is greater in favor of the South. The figures I shall present emphasize to a great extent the fact that the colored people who inhabit the large cities of the North commit many more crimes than those who live in the large cities of the South. That goes to prove that when the colored people of the South go to the northern cities and attempt to rub elbows with the white people of the large cities of the North the result, to say the least, is unfortunate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand the main point the Senator from Louisiana is trying to make now is that segregation is a good thing. Is that true?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what we practice in the South, and it seems to be responsible for the great difference

in the number of crimes committed by the southern Negro compared with the crimes committed by the Negroes of the North, the Negroes of the North committing a greater number than the Negroes of the South.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to read into the RECORD at this time what Abraham Lincoln had to say on this very question in a speech which he delivered at Springfield, Ill., on June 26, 1857. He said:

There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people at the idea of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races. * * * A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as an immediate separation is impossible the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together. If white and black people never get together in Kansas, they will never mix blood in Kansas. This is at least one self-evident truth. A few free colored persons may get into the free States, in any event; but their number is too insignificant to amount to much in the way of mixing blood. * * *

Such separation, if it ever be effected at all, must be effected by colonization; and no political party, as such, is now doing anything directly for colonization. Party operations at present only favor or retard colonization incidentally. The enterprise is a difficult one, but where there is a will there is a way, and what colonization needs most is a hearty will. Will springs from the two elements of moral sense and self-interest. Let us be brought to believe it is morally right, and at the same time favorable to, or at least not against, our interest to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be. The children of Israel, to such numbers as to include 400,000 fighting men, went out of Egyptian bondage in a body.

That Mr. President, was Abraham Lincoln speaking. That is what he said in 1857; so it seemed that Lincoln thought the Negroes should be segregated as much as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. During the course of my remarks I had expected to refer not only to the quotation the Senator read from Abraham Lincoln, but a number of other quotations from some of his speeches respecting what he thought about the colored people. I am glad, however, that the distinguished Senator has read during the course of my remarks the quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speech.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted I was about to give to the Senate comparative figures of the number of arrests in the city of New Orleans and in the city of Washington for the year 1935 and also for the years 1936 and 1937. The 1930 census showed the total population of Washington, D. C., to be 486,869, and that of New Orleans 458,762. The difference in population between the two cities was a little more than 25,000; and, strange as it may seem, the difference between the number of colored people in the city of New Orleans and in the city of Washington was only 1 percent. Twenty-eight percent of the total population of New Orleans was colored and 27 percent of the total population of Washington was colored.

I have obtained from the United States Bureau of the Census the population figures of the two cities, and I have obtained from the chiefs of police of Washington

and New Orleans the crime figures of the two cities.

In 1935 the figures for murder in New Orleans were, whites 22, colored, 26. The figures for murder in Washington in 1935 were whites 19, colored 53.

In the same year in New Orleans the figures for manslaughter were 27 whites and 10 colored. In Washington the figure for manslaughter were 29 whites and 15 colored.

In the same year the figures for rape in New Orleans were whites 7, and colored 11, whereas in Washington the figures for rape were whites 9, and colored 13.

The figures for robbery in New Orleans were 52 whites and 29 colored; whereas in Washington they were 163 whites and 359 colored.

The figures for aggravated assault, New Orleans, whites 107, colored 111; in Washington, whites 105; colored 313.

The figures for burglary in New Orleans were whites 119, colored 131; whereas in Washington the figures were whites 301, colored 916.

The figures for larceny in New Orleans, whites 427, colored 399; whereas in Washington the figures were whites 209 and colored 330.

The figures for auto thefts in New Orleans were 31 whites, 18 colored; whereas in Washington the figures were 146 whites and only 5 colored.

I now give the total figures of crimes committed in the two cities.

In the city of New Orleans, with a population of 458,000, 28 percent of which are colored, the total for the whites was 792, in contrast with 135 for the colored. In Washington, with only 25,000 more people, and 1 percent less colored people than New Orleans, the total for whites was 981, and for colored 2,004.

Mr. President, those figures are significant. They show that in the city of New Orleans in the year 1935 for every white man who committed one of the crimes which I have enumerated, approximately one colored person committed the same crime. But in Washington, D. C., the proportion is 981 to 2,004. Comparing Washington with New Orleans, the colored people of New Orleans committed 735 of such crimes, in contrast with 2,004 committed by the colored people in Washington. The ratio is almost 3 to 1, as between the colored people of Washington and the colored people of New Orleans, whereas comparing the number of whites in Washington who committed such crimes with the number of colored people in Washington who committed the same crimes, the ratio is almost 3½ to 1.

For the year 1936, the figures show that the two cities had approximately the same population, and the same percentage of colored people. The percentage for Washington was 27, while that for New Orleans was 28. The total number of crimes of the character described committed by the whites in New Orleans in 1936 was 753, as against 718 for the colored people. In Washington the total for the same crimes was 777 for the whites, in contrast to 2,810 for the colored people.

As I have stated, the percentage of Negro population in both cities is almost

the same. There is only 1 percent difference. In New Orleans there is 1 percent more colored population than in Washington, and yet in New Orleans the number of colored people arrested for the crimes which I have mentioned totaled 718, in contrast with 2,810 in Washington.

Data from police records of cities of Washington, D. C., and New Orleans, La., showing arrests for certain crimes, as between whites and Negroes, years 1935 and 1936

	1935			1936		
	Whites	Colored	Total	Whites	Colored	Total
City of New Orleans:						
Murders.....	22	26	48	23	24	47
Manslaughter.....	27	10	37	14	5	19
Rape.....	7	11	18	9	11	20
Robbery.....	52	29	81	57	40	97
Aggravated assault.....	107	111	218	108	122	230
Burglary.....	119	131	250	142	165	307
Larceny.....	427	399	826	375	339	714
Automobile theft.....	31	18	49	25	12	37
Total.....	792	735	1,527	753	718	1,471
	about even			about even		
City of Washington:						
Murders.....	19	53	72	17	42	59
Manslaughter.....	29	15	44	6	6	12
Rape.....	9	13	22	5	9	14
Robbery.....	163	359	522	212	644	856
Assault.....	105	313	418	78	296	374
Housebreaking (burglary).....	301	916	1,217	297	1,465	1,762
Larceny.....	209	330	539	149	348	497
Automobile theft.....	146	5	151	13		13
Total.....	981	2,004	2,985	777	2,810	3,587
	over 2 to 1			almost 4 to 1		

Population, Washington, D. C., and New Orleans, La.

[Figures furnished by Dr. Truesdell, Chief of Census Bureau, taken from 1930 census]

	Washington	New Orleans
Total population.....	486,869	458,762
Negro population.....	132,068	129,632
Percentage of Negro population to total.....	27	28

Arrests, city of New Orleans, 1937

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	20	31	61
Manslaughter.....	15	2	17
Rape.....	19	20	39
Robbery.....	28	34	62
Aggravated assault.....	66	97	163
Burglary.....	112	139	251
Larceny (includes petty larceny).....	262	409	771
Automobile theft.....	31	9	40
Total.....	663	741	1,404
Rate per 10,000 population.....	20	57	

Population.....	
Whites (72 percent).....	327,729
Negroes (28 percent).....	129,632
Total.....	457,361

Crime figures furnished by Superintendent of Police, New Orleans.
Population figures from 1930 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Arrests, city of Washington, 1937

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	17	55	72
Manslaughter.....	5	2	7
Rape.....	6	27	33
Robbery.....	217	472	689
Aggravated assault.....	68	284	352
Burglary.....	283	991	1,274
Grand larceny.....	267	323	590
Automobile theft.....	1	2	3
Total.....	864	2,156	3,020
Rate per 10,000 population.....	24	163	

Mr. President, I ask that the entire table, together with the tables from which I am about to read, be placed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Population:	
Whites (73 percent).....	354,801
Negroes (27 percent).....	132,068
Total.....	486,869

Crime figures taken from 1937 Report of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1930 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census)

Arrests, city of Washington, 1938

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	7	55	62
Manslaughter.....	5	2	7
Rape.....	2	25	27
Robbery.....	209	577	786
Burglary.....	234	715	949
Grand larceny.....	177	244	421
Automobile theft.....	2	1	3
Total.....	636	1,619	2,245
Rate per 10,000 population.....	18	123	

Population (1930):	
Whites (72.7 percent).....	353,914
Negroes (27.1 percent).....	132,068
Total.....	485,982

Crime figures taken from 1938 Report of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1930 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Arrests, city of Washington, 1939

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	13	46	59
Manslaughter.....	1	5	6
Rape.....	3	15	18
Robbery.....	240	324	564
Burglary.....	468	715	1,183
Grand larceny.....	135	203	338
Automobile theft.....	5	5	10
Total.....	865	1,313	2,178
Rate per 10,000 population.....	24	99	

Population (1930):	
Whites (72.7 percent).....	353,914
Negroes (27.1 percent).....	132,068
Total.....	485,982

Crime figures taken from 1939 Report of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1930 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me take the figures for 1937, in the same two cities, New Orleans and Washington, to make the contrast. In the city of New Orleans, with the population and the percentage of colored people which I have just indicated, the number of whites who committed these crimes—that is, murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft—was 663, as compared with 741 for the Negroes. In the city of Washington, for the same year, the number of whites who committed these crimes or were arrested for them was 864, as compared with 2,156 for the colored people.

In the city of Washington the rate per 10,000 population among the whites was 24, and among the colored 163. Statistically speaking, every time a white person committed one of the crimes which I have enumerated, 6.8 colored people committed one of the same crimes.

In the city of New Orleans, for the same year, for every 10,000 population, 20 whites committed one of these crimes, in contrast with 57 Negroes. Every time a white person committed one of these crimes in the city of New Orleans, 2.8 colored people committed the same crimes.

All this goes to show that we in the South believe we know how to handle the colored people. We do not permit them, if we can help it, to associate with the whites on a social basis, as they attempt to do in the city of Washington and in other cities of our country. As I indicated yesterday, we of the South do not coddle the colored people by proposing legislation of which we do not expect them to take advantage. We do not enact legislation in the hope that the privileges granted to them will not be exercised by them. However, in the North the story is different. As I shall demonstrate, 18 States have enacted statutes giving to the colored people the right to eat in the same restaurants with white people, to be buried in the same cemeteries with white people, and to swim in the same swimming pools with the whites. When the poor devils try to exercise those rights they get into trouble. To my way of thinking that is what causes a great many of the crimes which lead to the figures which I have just read. That is why there is so much crime among the colored people of the North—much more crime than there is in the South among the colored race.

For the benefit of the Senate I propose to discuss further figures for the city of Washington and other large cities, in order to demonstrate that the difference in the commission of crimes which I have been trying to point out, as between the white people and the colored people in New Orleans and Washington, prevails in other large cities to about the same extent as I have indicated. I shall now proceed with further figures on the subject in order to prove my point. I shall continue to give figures for the city of Washington. These figures are based on the crimes which I have previously enumerated, that is, murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, burglary, grand larceny, and auto theft.

In 1938, with a white population in the city of Washington of 353,914, or 72.7

percent of the entire population, and a colored population of 132,068, or 27.1 percent of the entire population, according to the 1930 Census, this is what the figures show:

For murder, 7 whites as against 55 colored; manslaughter, 5 whites as against 2 colored; rape, 2 whites as against 25 colored; robbery, 209 whites as against 577 colored; burglary, 234 whites as against 715 colored; grand larceny, 177 whites as against 244 colored; auto theft, 2 whites as against 1 colored. The total figures show that 636 white people committed the crimes which I have just indicated, as against 1,619 colored people. The number of whites who committed these crimes per 10,000 amounted to 18; and the number for the colored people was 123. In other words, for each white person in the city of Washington who committed these crimes in 1938, 6.8 colored people committed the same crimes. Do not forget, Mr. President, that the percentage of colored people in the city of Washington is approximately 27 percent, as contrasted with slightly more than 72 percent of whites.

I now proceed to the year 1939. For murder, 13 whites and 46 colored; manslaughter, 1 white and 5 colored; rape, 3 whites and 15 colored; robbery, 240 whites and 324 colored; burglary, 468 whites and 715 colored; grand larceny, 135 whites and 203 colored; auto theft, 5 whites and 5 colored. The totals are 865 whites and 1,313 colored. The rate per 10,000 population was 24 for whites and 99 for colored. To put it in another way, in 1939 every time a white person in Washington committed one of these crimes 4.1 colored persons committed one of the same crimes. I wish to reemphasize that the percentage of colored population was approximately 27 percent, as compared with approximately 72 percent white.

For 1940, in the city of Washington: Murder, 7 whites and 44 Negroes; manslaughter, 3 whites and 5 Negroes; rape, 8 whites and 11 Negroes; robbery, 125 whites and 426 Negroes; burglary, whites, 446; Negroes, 925; grand larceny, whites, 144; Negroes, 270; auto theft, whites, 4; Negroes, 1. Total: whites, 737; colored, 1,682. Rate per 10,000: Whites 21, colored, 208.

In other words, Mr. President, in the great city of Washington, where today there is a persistent clamor for voting, for electing their own officials, I wonder what would happen if the people of Washington could vote and if the colored population of Washington continued to increase so that the colored and white population would be about on a 50-50 basis. I wonder what would happen then in the great city of Washington.

As I have just indicated, for 1940 the rate per thousand was 21 for whites, and 208 for colored. In other words, every time one white man committed one of these crimes in the city of Washington 9.9 colored men committed similar crimes—a proportion of almost 1 to 10. Yet some Senators are trying to impose laws of the kind of the FEPC in the hope that they can show us how to handle the colored problem in the South.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1940

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	7	44	51
Manslaughter.....	3	5	8
Rape.....	8	11	19
Robbery.....	125	426	551
Burglary.....	446	925	1,371
Grand larceny.....	144	270	414
Automobile theft.....	4	1	5
Total.....	737	1,682	2,419
Rate per 10,000 population.....	21	208	-----

Population (1930):
Whites (72.7 percent)..... 353,914
Negroes (27.1 percent)..... 132,068

Total..... 485,982
Crime figures taken from 1940 Report of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1930 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now wish to cite the figures for the city of Washington in 1941:

Murder, whites 12; Negroes 41; manslaughter, whites 14; Negroes 7; rape, whites 5; Negroes 24; robbery, whites 303; Negroes 519; burglary, whites 504; Negroes 1,133; grand larceny, whites 148; Negroes 261; auto theft, whites 4; Negroes 3. Total, whites 990; Negroes 1,988. Rate per thousand of population: Whites 21; colored 116—or, to put it in another way—every time 1 white man committed any one of those crimes in the city of Washington, D. C., 5.5 colored men committed similar crimes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1941

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	12	41	53
Manslaughter.....	14	7	21
Rape.....	5	24	29
Robbery.....	303	519	822
Burglary.....	504	1,133	1,637
Grand larceny.....	148	261	409
Auto theft.....	4	3	7
Total.....	990	1,988	2,978
Rate per 10,000 population.....	21	116	-----

Population (1940):
Whites (72.8 percent)..... 474,326
Negroes (28.2 percent)..... 187,266

Total..... 661,592
Figures furnished by the office of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that for 1941 the percentage of whites to Negroes increased slightly in the District of Columbia. The whites numbered 474,326, under the 1940 census, or 72.8 percent of the total population of the city, whereas the colored numbered 187,266, or 28.2 percent of the

total population, instead of the 27 percent which I indicated a while ago for the 1930 Census.

In 1942 the arrests in the city of Washington were as follows: Murder, whites 10, Negroes 55; manslaughter, whites 14, Negroes 4; rape, whites 8, Negroes 29; robbery, whites 165; Negroes 452; burglary, whites 571, Negroes 920; grand larceny, whites 186, Negroes 233; auto theft, whites 5, Negroes 4. Total: Whites 959, Negroes 1,697.

Rate per 10,000: Whites 20, Negroes 90—or, put in another way, for every white man who committed one of those crimes, there were 4.5 colored who committed one. The year 1942 was the only one among all the years since 1935 for which I have submitted data, in which the proportion as between colored and whites arrested for crimes was as low as 4 to 1. In all the other years it was either 5 to 1 or higher—up to the ratio I indicated a moment ago of 9.9.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1942

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	10	55	65
Manslaughter.....	14	4	18
Rape.....	8	29	27
Robbery.....	165	452	617
Burglary.....	571	920	1,491
Grand larceny.....	186	233	419
Auto theft.....	5	4	9
Total.....	959	1,697	2,646
Rate per 10,000 population.....	20	90	-----

Population (1940):
Whites (72.8 percent)..... 474,326
Negroes (28.2 percent)..... 187,266

Total..... 661,592
Crime figures furnished by the office of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.
Population figures from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in 1943, the arrests in the city of Washington were as follows:

Murder, whites 16; Negroes 55; manslaughter, whites 4; Negroes 1; rape, whites 3; Negroes 8; robbery, whites 136; Negroes 503; burglary, whites 414; Negroes 1,303; grand larceny, whites 259; Negroes 361; auto theft, whites 2; Negroes, 2. Total: Whites 834; Negroes 2,233.

Rate per 10,000 population: Whites 17; Negroes 119—or, put in another way, for every white man who committed one of those crimes in the city of Washington, 7 colored people did; and Mr. President, please bear in mind that, as I indicated a moment ago, in that year 72 percent of the population of Washington was white and 28 percent was colored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1943

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	16	55	71
Manslaughter.....	4	1	5
Rape.....	3	8	11
Robbery.....	136	503	639
Burglary.....	414	1,303	1,717
Grand larceny.....	259	361	620
Auto theft.....	2	2	4
Total.....	834	2,233	3,067
Rate per 10,000 population.....	17	119	

Population (1940):
Whites (72.8 percent)..... 474,326
Negroes (28.2 percent)..... 187,266

Total..... 661,592

Figures furnished by the office of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.

Population figures from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the year 1944, in the city of Washington, our great capital, we find the following figures:

Murder, whites 9; Negroes 46; manslaughter, whites 9; Negroes 3; rape, whites 6; Negroes 15; robbery, whites 171; Negroes 480; burglary, whites 601; Negroes 1,062; grand larceny, whites 173; Negroes 328; auto theft, whites 12; Negroes 0. Total: Whites 981; Negroes 1,934.

Rate per 10,000: Whites 20; Negroes 103—or, for every white man who committed one of those crimes, there were 5.1 colored men who did.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1944

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	9	46	55
Manslaughter.....	9	3	12
Rape.....	6	15	21
Robbery.....	171	480	651
Burglary.....	601	1,062	1,663
Grand larceny.....	173	328	501
Automobile theft.....	12	0	12
Total.....	981	1,934	2,915
Rate per 10,000 population.....	20	103	

Population (1940):
Whites (72.8 percent)..... 474,326
Negroes (28.2 percent)..... 187,266

Figures furnished by the office of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.

Population figures from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for last year, 1945, the figures are as follows: Murder, whites 6, Negroes 54; manslaughter, whites 3, Negroes 8; rape, whites 5, Negroes 19; robbery, whites 141, Negroes 400; burglary, whites 605, Negroes 1,034; grand larceny, whites 214, Negroes 421; auto theft, whites 14, Negroes 0. Total: Whites 988, Negroes 1,936.

Rate per 10,000 of population: Whites 21, colored 104—or in the proportion of 5.2 Negroes to every white man who committed one of those crimes in the city of Washington, where the population was divided as between whites and

Negroes according to the percentages which I have previously indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Washington, 1945

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	6	54	60
Manslaughter.....	3	8	11
Rape.....	5	19	24
Robbery.....	141	400	541
Burglary.....	605	1,034	1,639
Grand larceny.....	214	421	635
Automobile theft.....	14	0	14
Total.....	988	1,936	2,924
Rate per 10,000 population.....	21	104	

Population (1940):
Whites (72.8 percent)..... 474,326
Negroes (28.2 percent)..... 187,266

Figures furnished by the office of the Major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia.

Population figures from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Source: W. H. Gilbert, General Research Section, Jan. 30, 1946.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that completes the figures for our great Capital City. I wish to say that I have before me, and I expect to go through them, figures for many other cities. The figures for the cities of the North show about the same percentages as those I have just indicated for our great Capital City of Washington. In a few instances the ratio as between whites and colored is slightly higher.

I shall point out a little later the situation in the South. For the years for which I have been able to obtain comparable figures in order to show the differential, I find that in the city of Houston, Tex., for instance, the situation which prevailed there was about the same as that prevailing in the city of New Orleans.

There is only one southern city in which the percentage is not so great as it is in northern cities. I refer to the city of Charleston, S. C. The only reason which I have been able to assign for that situation is that the population as between the whites and the colored in that city is almost equal. If I am incorrect in my statement, I hope that my distinguished colleague who is now occupying the chair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will tell me at the proper time.

In the city of Charleston, as I have said, the population as between the whites and the blacks is almost equal. The percentage of whites is 52 or 53. The remainder of the population is colored. When the colored people in the South are permitted to congregate in large numbers in one place, such as in a large city, they usually get into more mischief than when they are scattered about. I can say that such a condition prevails in several of the southern cities with which I am familiar. At the proper time—it may not be today, but some day next week—I expect to set forth figures pertaining to the city of Charleston. If

I have not stated the situation correctly I hope that my distinguished colleague from South Carolina will be thinking about the matter in the meantime and give us the benefit of his views on the subject.

Mr. President. I have put into the RECORD figures pertaining to our great Capital of Washington. I now proceed to St. Louis, Mo. The figures which I am about to submit cover the period of April, 1935, to March, 1936, or almost a year. The figures with reference to the whites and the blacks in the city of St. Louis, according to the 1930 Census, are as follows: Whites, 726,879; colored, 93,580. Eighty-eight percent plus represents the white population, and 11 percent plus represents the colored population.

I hope that the few Senators who are now present in the Chamber—I can almost count them on the fingers of one hand—will bear the percentages in mind when I read the number of whites and colored who committed various crimes.

The crimes which I have selected are, as will be noted, some of the most heinous that have ever been recorded in criminology. As I indicated in connection with previous tables which I placed in the RECORD, when considering all crimes it will be found that the proportion is greater in so far as northern colored persons are concerned than in respect to colored persons of the South. In the tables, not only has crime in the large cities been taken into consideration, but all crimes resulting in incarceration in Federal and State prisons and in reformatories. The figures which I shall read are in respect to large cities in the South where the Negroes represent a greater proportion of the total population than they do in some of the Northern cities. Having in mind the difference between the percentages with respect to the colored population and the white population of St. Louis. I repeat that the ratio is: Whites, 88 percent; colored, 11.

I read from the table as follows:

Murder, whites 21; Negroes 57.

I ask Senators to bear those figures in mind: Whites 21; Negroes 57. The population, as I have stated, is 11 percent colored as against 88 percent white.

Manslaughter, whites 124; Negroes 16; rape, whites 52; Negroes 57; robbery, whites 227; Negroes 163; burglary, whites 385; Negroes 496; aggravated assault, whites 182; Negroes 225; larceny, whites 1,315; Negroes 1,466; auto theft, whites 173; Negroes 89.

Total, whites 2,479; Negroes 2,609.

Rate per 10,000 population, whites 34; Negroes 267.

In other words, for every white man who committed one of the crimes to which I have referred in the city of St. Louis, 7.8 Negroes committed similar crimes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of St. Louis, April 1935 to
March 1936*

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	21	57	78
Manslaughter.....	124	16	140
Rape.....	52	97	149
Robbery.....	227	163	390
Burglary.....	385	496	881
Aggravated assault.....	182	225	407
Larceny.....	1,315	1,466	2,781
Auto theft.....	173	89	262
Total.....	2,479	2,609	5,088
Rate per 10,000 population.....	34	267	

Population:			
White (88 percent).....			726,879
Colored (11 percent).....			93,580
Total.....			820,459
Other.....			1,501
Total.....			821,960

Crime figures taken from annual report of Police Commissioners of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1936.
Population figures taken from 1930 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Here are more figures with reference to the city of St. Louis, covering the period from April 1, 1936, to March 31, 1937:

Murder, whites 28, Negroes 40; manslaughter, whites 121, Negroes 24; rape, whites 74, Negroes 97; robbery, whites 163, Negroes 156; aggravated assault, whites 178, Negroes 276; burglary, whites 380, Negroes 548; larceny, whites 1,330, Negroes 1,432; auto theft, whites 139, Negroes 65. Total: Whites 2,413; Negroes 2,638. Rate per 10,000 population: Whites 33, Negroes 282.

Or, Mr. President, to put it in another way, for every white man who committed one of these crimes in the city of St. Louis, 8.5 colored men committed similar crimes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of St. Louis, April 1, 1936, to
March 31, 1937*

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	28	40	68
Manslaughter.....	121	24	145
Rape.....	74	97	171
Robbery.....	163	156	319
Aggravated assault.....	178	276	454
Burglary.....	380	548	928
Larceny.....	1,330	1,432	2,762
Auto theft.....	139	65	204
Total.....	2,413	2,638	5,051
Rate per 10,000 population.....	33	282	

Population:			
White (88 percent).....			726,879
Colored (11 percent).....			93,580
Total.....			820,459
Other.....			1,501
Total.....			821,960

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioners of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1937.
Population figures taken from 1930 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue with figures pertaining to the city of St. Louis, and I now take the year 1939. I ask Senators to bear in mind the ratio of population in that city, namely, 88 whites to 11 Negroes.

Murder, whites 28; Negroes 33; manslaughter, whites 96; Negroes 27; rape,

whites 68; Negroes 93; robbery, whites 141; Negroes 114; burglary, whites 468; Negroes 480; aggravated assault, whites 133; Negroes 258; larceny, whites, 1,173; Negroes 1,186; auto theft, whites, 138; Negroes 66.

Total: Whites, 2,245; Negroes, 2,257.
Rate per 10,000 population: Whites, 31; Negroes, 243.

In other words, Mr. President, the figures show that 11 percent of the total population, consisting of Negroes, committed a greater number of crimes than did 88 percent of the population which consisted of whites. Every time one white man committed one of these crimes, 7.8 colored men committed similar crimes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1939

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	28	33	61
Manslaughter.....	96	27	123
Rape.....	68	93	161
Robbery.....	141	114	255
Burglary.....	468	480	948
Aggravated assault.....	133	258	391
Larceny.....	1,173	1,186	2,359
Automobile theft.....	138	66	204
Total.....	2,245	2,257	4,502
Rate per 10,000 population.....	31	243	

Population:			
White (88 percent).....			726,879
Colored (11 percent).....			93,580
Total.....			820,459
Other.....			1,501
Total.....			821,960

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioners of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1939.
Population figures taken from 1930 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I continue with figures in reference to the city of St. Louis for the year 1940. In that year the percentage of population as between the colored and white had changed. The white population constituted 86.6 percent of the total population in contrast to 13.3 percent of colored.

As will be noted, the colored population in the past 10 years in the city of St. Louis, that is, from 1930 to 1940, increased about 2.3 percent, but as will be noted from the figures which I shall read, the number of colored people, in contrast with the whites, who committed these crimes, changed very little. The lowest for any 1 year the records show is for the year 1943, when the contrast was, whites 1, compared to 5.5 for the colored. I read from the 1940 figures: Murder, whites 16; Negroes 41; manslaughter, whites 94; Negroes 21; rape, whites 74; Negroes 103; robbery, whites 164; Negroes 146; burglary, whites 405; Negroes 473; assault, whites 147; Negroes 262; larceny, whites 1,164; Negroes 1,163; auto theft, whites 126; Negroes 148. Total: Whites 2,190; Negroes 2,262. Rate per 10,000: Whites 31; Negroes 209. The ratio was 1 white to 6.7 Negroes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table from which I have just read be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1940

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	16	41	57
Manslaughter.....	94	21	115
Rape.....	74	103	177
Robbery.....	164	146	310
Burglary.....	405	473	878
Aggravated assault.....	147	262	409
Larceny.....	1,164	1,168	2,332
Automobile theft.....	126	48	174
Total.....	2,190	2,262	4,452
Rate per 10,000 population.....	31	209	

Population:			
White (86.6 percent).....			706,794
Colored (13.3 percent).....			108,765
Total.....			815,559
Other.....			489
Total.....			816,048

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioners of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1940.
Population figures taken from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue with the city of St. Louis for the year 1942. Murder, whites, 20; Negroes, 30; manslaughter, whites, 91; Negroes, 19; rape, whites, 56; Negroes, 78; robbery, whites, 101; Negroes, 62; burglary, whites, 339; Negroes, 272; aggravated assault, whites, 180; Negroes, 249.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has returned to the Chamber. What I am trying to do is to give to the Senate a statement of crimes committed in the various cities of the Nation. I have already stated the figures for the city of St. Louis. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has also returned to the Chamber, and I am glad he is present, and that I can state to him what I am attempting to do.

I am endeavoring to show to this august body that we in the South seem to be better able to take care of the Negro population than are our friends in the North. One of the ways by which I am attempting to show that, as I have just indicated for the city of St. Louis, is to present the figures as to crimes committed for both the whites and the colored people. St. Louis had a population of 11 percent colored and the remainder white. There were more crimes committed—that is, murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, larceny, and auto theft—among the colored people, with only 11 percent of the entire population, than among all the white people that accounted for 89 percent of the population. I am proceeding to show that the same condition existed in almost every year prior to the 1940 Census.

The last figure I read for the year 1942 was for aggravated assault.

Larceny, whites, 969; Negroes, 1,058; auto theft, whites, 153; Negroes, 68.

Total, whites, 1,909; Negroes, 1,836.

The rate per 10,000 population was, whites, 27; Negroes, 170.

To put it another way, every time one of these crimes was committed by a white man in the city of St. Louis during 1942 6.3 were committed by colored people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1942

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	20	30	50
Manslaughter.....	91	19	110
Rape.....	56	78	134
Robbery.....	101	62	163
Burglary.....	339	272	611
Aggravated assault.....	180	249	429
Larceny.....	969	1,058	2,027
Auto theft.....	153	68	221
Total.....	1,909	1,836	3,745
Rate per 10,000 population.....	27	170	

Population:	
Whites (86.6 percent).....	706,794
Colored (13.3 percent).....	108,765
Total.....	815,559
Other.....	489
Total.....	816,048

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioner of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1942.
Population figures taken from the 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, now I continue with the city of St. Louis, for the year 1943. As I indicated a while ago, for this year the contrast as between whites and colored is the smallest of any of the years for which I have the figures from 1935 to 1945.

Murder, whites, 25; colored, 33; manslaughter, whites, 91; colored, 22; rape, whites, 78; Negroes, 79; robbery, whites, 68; Negroes, 50; burglary, whites, 425; Negroes, 254; aggravated assault, whites, 190; Negroes, 263; larceny, whites, 1,018; Negroes, 910; auto theft, whites, 123; Negroes, 53. Total: Whites, 2,018; Negroes, 1,664.

Rate per 10,000 population, whites, 28; Negroes, 154.

For every white man, 5.5 colored men were arrested for one of the crimes I have mentioned. The population ratio is the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1943

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	25	33	58
Manslaughter.....	91	22	113
Rape.....	78	79	157
Robbery.....	68	50	118
Burglary.....	425	254	679
Aggravated assault.....	190	263	453
Larceny.....	1,018	910	1,928
Auto theft.....	123	53	176
Total.....	2,018	1,664	3,682
Rate per 10,000 population.....	28	154	

Population:	
Whites (86.6 percent).....	706,794
Colored (13.3 percent).....	108,765
Total.....	815,559
Other.....	489
Total.....	816,048

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioner of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1943.
Population figures taken from the 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I continue with the city of St. Louis, for 1944.

Murder, whites, 24; Negroes, 28; manslaughter, whites, 63; Negroes, 10; rape, whites, 71; Negroes, 59; robbery, whites, 109; Negroes, 109; burglary, whites, 430; Negroes, 450; aggravated assault, whites, 145; Negroes, 222; larceny, whites, 777; Negroes, 923; auto theft, whites, 198; Negroes, 106.

Total: Whites, 1,817; Negroes, 1,907.
Rate per 10,000: Whites, 26; Negroes, 177.

In other words, every time one white man committed one of these crimes or was arrested for one of these crimes in the city of St. Louis in 1944, 6.8 colored persons were arrested for a similar offense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1944

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	24	28	52
Manslaughter.....	63	10	73
Rape.....	71	59	130
Robbery.....	109	109	218
Burglary.....	430	450	880
Aggravated assault.....	145	222	367
Larceny.....	777	923	1,700
Automobile theft.....	198	106	304
Total.....	1,817	1,907	3,724
Rate per 10,000 population.....	26	177	

Population:	
Whites (86.6 percent).....	706,794
Colored (13.3 percent).....	108,765
Total.....	815,559
Other.....	489
Total.....	816,048

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioner of St. Louis, Mo., dated March 31, 1944.
Population figures taken from the 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now come to the year 1945 for the city of St. Louis: Murder, whites, 25; Negroes, 50; manslaughter, white, 65; Negroes 12; rape, whites, 74; Negroes, 74; robbery, whites, 102; Negroes, 92; burglary, whites, 398; Negroes, 302; aggravated assault, whites, 109; Negroes, 225; larceny, whites, 809; Negroes, 890; auto theft, whites, 304; Negroes, 95.

Total number of whites arrested 1,886; total number of Negroes arrested 1,740. The rate per 10,000 of the population is: whites arrested 27, Negroes arrested 161, showing a ratio between the whites and Negroes of 1 to 6.

Mr. President, I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of St. Louis, 1945

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	25	50	75
Manslaughter.....	65	12	77
Rape.....	74	74	148
Robbery.....	102	92	194
Burglary.....	398	302	700
Aggravated assault.....	109	225	334
Larceny.....	809	890	1,699
Auto theft.....	304	95	399
Total.....	1,886	1,740	3,626
Rate per 10,000 population.....	27	161	

Population:	
Whites (86.6 percent).....	706,794
Colored (13.3 percent).....	108,765
Total.....	815,559
Other.....	489
Total.....	816,048

Crime figures taken from annual report of police commissioner of St. Louis, Mo., dated Mar. 31, 1945.
Population figures taken from the 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now take up the figures for the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. I do not see in the Chamber at the moment either of the distinguished Senators who represent the State in which that great city is located. I am sure the reason they are not present is that they are busy in connection with committee hearings which are being held this afternoon. I know it is most difficult for Senators to attend sessions of the Senate and listen to the important debate which is now proceeding. Of course, it is excusable for Senators to be absent when they have work which is more important to them or to the country outside the Senate Chamber than in it. I have no reason to complain because they are not present.

Mr. President, I should like to call especial attention to the comparisons I have made and shall continue to make between the number of white persons who commit crimes and the number of colored persons who commit crimes. I emphasize that this is one method of demonstrating that we from the South are in a much better position to cope with the Negro problem than the people of the North, if only we are permitted to do so.

I repeat, Mr. President, enactment into law of the pending bill will not cope with the problem. Neither will the many bills which have been introduced in the Senate with a view of appeasing a few miserable groups of politicians here and there all over the Nation who are trying to vie with each other for the colored vote. I wish I could believe that that is not what is in the mind of some of those who are urging the passage of this bill, but I cannot help think it is. I am earnestly pleading with Senators not to make it impossible for us from the South to cope with the Negro problem. The Negroes have been our wards since they were sold as slaves generations ago. I believe if an honest attempt were made to determine who is best qualified to handle this problem it would be found that we of the South are best qualified to handle it. I do not like to think of this great body considering legislation which has back of it the idea of getting the support of the colored voters.

Mr. President, we who represent Southern States are making many sacrifices in our attempt to oppose the pending bill. Many of my colleagues might think it is an easy thing to stand on the floor of the Senate and talk for 4 or 5 or 6 hours every day. I do not mind it, although it takes a considerable amount of my energy to do so. But, as I have said on frequent occasions, in order to preserve the liberties which we have enjoyed since the Constitution was adopted and which have made us a great Nation and brought prosperity to the citizenry of the Republic, I for one am willing, in the effort to prevent the passage of such legislation

as this, to discuss the question so long as God gives me breath.

As I expect to show in the course of my remarks, if we permit bills of this character to pass this body and be passed by the House of Representatives and become law, I have no doubt that the same forces which have demanded this legislation will go a step further and seek to obtain other legislation which will probably be a little more obnoxious, and which will lead to the point where the advocates of strange and foreign doctrines may achieve the goal for which they are now striving.

I repeat what I said on the floor of the Senate back in 1938. If we give the colored people of this Nation political equality it will lead to social equality; and social equality will lead to the degradation of our race. If any Senator has the time to listen to me in the course of this debate I will prove to him that I am right historically. I do not expect to do so this afternoon, because I do not have the time. I have other arguments to deal with for the moment. I shall probably reach that point by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I should like to have Senators listen to me, in the hope that I may convert them before it is too late.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana knows that I have listened to him very patiently. I should like to ask him a question.

The Senator made reference to other legislation. Am I correct in inferring that the Senator might feel justified in using the same technique of the filibuster in attempting to defeat minimum wage legislation?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; absolutely not. I would not attempt to do so. Of course, the Senator knows that in the minimum wage legislation as it was originally introduced there were a few obnoxious sections of the bill which I seriously opposed. I refer to that provision of the bill which would give to the Administrator the right to select advisory committees for each industry, with full power to go into each industry and classify every job, from that of floor sweeper up, and fix minimum wages along the lines as Congress is being asked to do. I am sure that the distinguished Senator does not want that. In the full committee some time ago that clause was stricken out.

As I said yesterday, if the minimum wage bill were enacted by the Congress as written and introduced, and then we should place the pending bill, as written, on the statute books, it is my considered judgment that we might as well hang a large black crepe on the door of private enterprise, because there would be one law to tell an employer whom to hire and another law to tell him how much he must pay to each employee.

XCII—67

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will recall that the Senator from Oregon joined in the vote against the particular provision of the minimum wage bill to which he has alluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. But I stress to the Senator from Louisiana that I joined in a vote; and I wish the Senator from Louisiana would make it possible for us to vote on the floor of the Senate on the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is interested in the consideration of other legislation, all that is necessary is to place the pending bill back on the calendar, and we can then consider all the legislation which the Senator desires to consider. It can be done very easily.

Mr. President, I was about to consider figures for the city of Cincinnati. I am glad to see that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is present.

In 1936, in the city of Cincinnati there was a white population of 403,112, or approximately 89 percent of the total. The colored population was 47,818, representing approximately 11 percent of the entire population. Members of other races numbered 230. The total population was 451,160. I should like to have Senators bear those figures in mind. Of the entire population, approximately 89 percent was white, and 11 percent colored. I shall proceed to show that in 1936, with respect to the crimes of murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft, the Negroes, who constituted 11 percent of the population, committed more of those crimes than did the whites, who constituted approximately 89 percent of the entire population. The figures are as follows:

Murder and manslaughter are combined in this table. I do not know why, but they are combined. For murder and manslaughter, whites, 25; Negroes, 48. For rape, whites, 29; Negroes, 16. For robbery, whites, 79; Negroes, 156. For aggravated assault, 71 whites, and 180 Negroes. For burglary, 241 whites and 294 Negroes. For larceny, 384 whites and 454 Negroes. For auto thefts, 92 Negroes and 83 whites. The total number for whites was 921, as against 1,231 for Negroes.

Bear in mind, as I have stated, that the colored population was approximately 11 percent of the total, as contrasted with approximately 89 percent for the whites, and yet the colored people living there, who constituted 11 percent of the entire population, committed 300 more of these crimes than did the whites.

The rate per 10,000 population for the whites was 23, and for Negroes 258. In other words, for every white person who committed one of those crimes in the city of Cincinnati in 1936, there were 11.2 Negroes. I ask unanimous consent that the table from which I have been reading be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1936

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	25	48	73
Manslaughter.....	29	16	45
Rape.....	79	156	235
Robbery.....	71	180	251
Aggravated assault.....	241	294	535
Burglary.....	384	454	838
Larceny, theft.....	92	83	175
Automobile theft.....			
Total.....	921	1,231	2,152
Rate per 10,000 population.....	23	258	

Population:	
White (89 percent).....	403,112
Colored (11 percent).....	47,818
Total.....	450,930
Other.....	230
Total.....	451,160

Crime figures taken from Annual Report of Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1936.
Population figures taken from 1936 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MEAD. I do not wish to argue in defense of the commission of crime by anyone, but I am wondering if my distinguished colleague, who has taken such an enthusiastic interest in good housing, would go along with me to a certain extent in my thought that probably society or the Government may be in some degree responsible for this situation. I think the Senator will agree with me that the education, housing, and economic condition of the Negro have been more or less neglected. If the Negro could have the advantages which people more fortunately situated have had, he, too, would be an improved citizen. We are told by experts that it is difficult to expect that there will be less crime in a blighted area, a slum area, than there is in an area which is up to date and has all the advantages which higher standards provide. I am not finding fault with the figures which my distinguished colleague is citing. I know nothing about them. I suppose he obtained them from some Government agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. All the crime figures I have submitted were obtained from official sources and those for Cincinnati were furnished me from reports of the Division of Police, Department of Safety, of the city of Cincinnati.

Mr. MEAD. Does not the Senator agree with me that there is a responsibility which we may have neglected, in the provision of good housing, better economic conditions, and better educational facilities for the Negroes? While I know that religion has done a noble work wherever opportunity and facilities were available, yet there is also in this field further opportunity, I think, for more work to be done. I believe further that the Government has neglected its obligation, and perhaps we are somewhat responsible.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt that what the Senator says is correct; but do not forget that in the city of Cincinnati there are as many poor white people as there are poor colored people, if not more. The figures which I am presenting to the Senate are not taken from a selected

class. They represent all the whites. The Lord knows that in the city of Cincinnati—and the same thing holds true of the city of New York—a large proportion of the white population is just as poor and in just as bad condition economically as are the colored people.

The only reason I am citing these figures, as I have stated on this floor on many occasions, is simply to show that the white people in the North do not seem to be able to cope with the colored problem as we in the South do. The Senator was not present a while ago when I was discussing this question. No doubt he was busy before some committee. I am sure that many other Senators who were not present were as busy before committees as was the Senator from New York.

The point is that I compared the figures for the city of New Orleans with those for the city of Washington. The population of the city of Washington is almost the same as that of the city of New Orleans; and the Negro population in Washington is only 1 percent less than the Negro population in New Orleans. Yet, strange as it may seem, in the city of New Orleans, for every white person who committed one of these crimes there were 2.1 Negroes. In the city of Washington the figures are as high as 9.9 Negroes for every white person.

The Senator appreciates the difference I am trying to point out there.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I understand the difference.

Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague further yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. There is a serious problem of adjustment to be considered. For instance, if a number of the members of colored population in a rural area of a Southern State were suddenly transported to a large industrial city of the North, probably in some instances they would not be as readily received as other persons would be. In some cases they are the last to be hired and, again, the first to be fired. There is a period of adjustment which leaves them somewhat handicapped.

So it occurs to me that with a good background of education, with fair economic opportunity, with decent living conditions, with good housing—which has much to do—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am prompt to confess that good housing would to a considerable extent relieve the situation. But I doubt whether the proportion to which I have referred would differ, because if housing conditions for the poorer white people were improved, the extent to which such persons would become involved in crime would no doubt decrease almost to the same extent it would decrease in the case of the colored people, if their living conditions or housing were improved.

Mr. MEAD. I recognize in my colleague from Louisiana a staunch advocate of good housing, and his present interest in that subject is reassuring. But we are told by experts who have studied crime that slums are the greatest breeders of crime. Invariably a great many of the southern colored people who find their way to the large industrial cities of

the North live in blighted areas—even in slums.

If that be true, we have the obligation of seeing to it that they live in good, clean, healthful, sanitary homes. We are all aware that many colored people who have a good economic and educational background and who live in good communities are fine, outstanding citizens.

I think we can in large part correct the situation to which reference has been made by assuming the responsibility, which is ours, of giving the colored people the opportunity they have earned and to which they are entitled. So I wish to impress upon my distinguished colleague the necessity of our assuming that responsibility. The colored people are here in the United States, they are citizens of this country. They have fought for our democracy. They have done hard, laborious work, both in the South and in the North. If we give them a good educational background, if we provide the decent housing conditions which this rich country can very well provide, if we see to it that the economic conditions of the colored people are improved, we shall get at the root of the difficulty which the Senator has pointed out this afternoon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I assure my distinguished colleague the Senator from New York that, as a coauthor of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill on housing, I shall do all I can to see to it that that housing bill is enacted by the Congress. So far as I personally am concerned, I wish to say further that I am a strong advocate of increasing the opportunities of the colored people. I have done that all my life, in the South. I was a member of the Louisiana Legislature from 1924 until I came to the Senate of the United States, and my record will show that I have done all I could do to help the colored people.

As I said yesterday in the Senate, today we in Louisiana are spending more money for the education of the colored people of our State than was spent in Louisiana for the education of both whites and Negroes back in 1909, the year I entered college.

We have made great progress in the South. All I am asking is that we be allowed to settle our own problems. I do not wish to do anything here which would cause the colored people to be placed on a basis of social equality with the white people, because the moment that were done, the moment such things were permitted, a course would be started which, within 300 or 400 years, would end in our having a mongrel race, such as has developed in Brazil. As I pointed out yesterday during the debate, Brazil is a larger and older country than the United States. But what happened there? When the European settlers went to that great country, they intermarried with the Indians who lived there. Later on, the prosperous Brazilians imported a number of African slaves to help grow the crops. In the course of a few years the colored people who went there from Africa intermarried with the Indians, and some of the white people intermarried with some of the colored people. Today in Brazil there

is a mongrel race. The result is that a country which is richer and larger than ours and older than ours is now as far back, in respect to progress, as it was in 1512.

Mr. MEAD. But, Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me again, let me say that some of the countries from which the people who settled in Brazil came are not much better off, today, or even as well off, as Brazil itself is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator from New York mention any country where that is due to mongrelization? What he says might be due to the fact that some of the poorer countries may have been overpowered by others. But Brazil has never been involved in any wars of any consequence—none sufficient to destroy her. Brazil could have made the same progress we have made, or even better progress than we have made, because, as I have said, Brazil has more resources than we have; Brazil has a finer climate, generally speaking; everything has been to her advantage. Yet she is hundreds of years back of the United States, insofar as progress is concerned. I attribute that condition to the fact that in Brazil there is, today, a mongrel race, just as a mongrel race developed in Egypt centuries ago. At first there was an Aryan race in Egypt. Egyptian history shows that in science, medicine, and the other arts Egypt went very far in olden times. But when the Pharaohs decided to build the Pyramids, the Egyptians imported a number of Ethiopians to help them do the heavy work. What happened? In less than 50 years those colored Ethiopians began to intermingle with the Egyptians, to such an extent that at the end of 50 years the Egyptians passed a law making it a felony punishable by death for any more Ethiopians to come within the borders of Egypt. But it was too late. Mongrelization had already started. In less than 400 years the situation had deteriorated to such an extent that a mulatto was at the head of the Egyptian dynasty.

I do not want such a thing to happen in the United States.

However, the establishment of social equality between the whites and the colored people would be the beginning of a similar process or development in the United States. Once social equality was established, the result in our country inevitably would be similar to that in Egypt. It might not come to pass within my generation or within the generation of my son's son's son, but the time would come.

That is what the colored people are trying to do today. They are doing everything they can to attain social equality with the white race. But as I have said, I will talk as long as God gives me breath to prevent it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am sure that any student of history or any Member of the Senate might find ample argument and material to fit his fancy, if he studied the very beginnings of civilization, as to the reasons for the decay or degeneration of either governments, civilizations, or peoples. Such decadence may be attributed to many causes.

But regardless of that subject, regardless of what caused the fall of Rome or the ruination of ancient Greece or the decay of the Egyptian civilization, such considerations have no bearing upon the necessity for the improvement of the economic opportunity of the colored people who are citizens of our country. I am sure my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will admit that it is not sufficient to provide them with educational opportunity for 10 or 15 weeks of the year, in a one-room schoolhouse, with an underpaid teacher. We all admit such education would not be very advantageous and would not prove beneficial. Nor can we expect the finest type of citizenship to emanate from an educational background so meager and as limited as that. I am sure the Senator will also agree that bringing up a family in a one-room shack which is not much better than a barn is not conducive to the development of good citizenship. I do not believe we can expect to produce the best type of citizens if our wage standards are so low that the people can hardly keep body and soul together. We still have, I insist, the obligation to improve the economic conditions which we all admit are present and are indefensible in a country so rich as ours.

So, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague for his continued interest in the matter of providing good housing for the people of this country. I believe that in the slums and in the blighted areas the Senator will find, according to expert testimony on the subject, some explanation for the difficulties which he has associated with the colored race. As I have said, I know many of them who have excellent backgrounds, and have had opportunities to work and obtain educations. They are very fine citizens. I think that if we were to discharge our obligation and make it possible for Negroes as a whole to obtain educations, homes, and jobs, it would pay rich dividends.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat to my distinguished colleague that I am in accord with doing what he has suggested being done. Our only difference is with regard to the method of doing it. We will never attain the conditions which he has described by the enactment of such a bill as the one now pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, I desire to continue with facts and figures relating to the city of Cincinnati. A moment ago I presented figures for the year 1937. I shall now proceed to give figures for the year 1938. For the benefit of many Senators who have entered the Chamber since I began this discussion, I may state that I have been arguing for a part of the afternoon in order to show that we of the South are much better able to cope with the Negro problem than are the people in the North. We do not permit colored people to rub elbows with us and be received socially by us, but we do assist them.

The entire population of the city of Cincinnati consists of 11 percent Negroes and 89 percent whites. In that city Negroes committed more crimes consisting of murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery,

burglary, aggravated assault, larceny, and auto theft than were committed by whites. The figures are as follows:

Murder and manslaughter, whites 16, Negroes 37; rape, whites 20, Negroes 22; robbery, whites 127, Negroes 169; aggravated assault, whites 61, Negroes 185; burglary, whites 382, Negroes 290; larceny, whites 675, Negroes 746; auto theft, whites 76, Negroes 70.

Total, whites 1,357, Negroes 1,519.

Or, to put the figures in another form, the rate per 10,000 population was, whites 34, Negroes 316.

Mr. President, by those figures it will be seen that for every white man who committed one of these crimes in Cincinnati, the white population of which constitutes 89 percent of the whole, 9.3 Negroes committed similar crimes.

The same situation prevailed with respect to the years 1939, 1940, and 1941, and in almost the same proportion as that which I have just indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1938

	Whites	Negroes	Total
Murder.....	16	37	53
Manslaughter.....	20	22	42
Rape.....	127	169	296
Robbery.....	61	185	246
Aggravated assault.....	382	290	672
Burglary.....	675	746	1,421
Larceny theft.....	76	70	146
Automobile theft.....			
Total.....	1,357	1,519	2,876
Rate per 10,000 population.....	34	316	

Population:	
White (89 percent).....	403,112
Colored (11 percent).....	47,818
Total.....	450,930
Other.....	230
Total.....	451,160

Crime figures taken from the Annual Report of Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1938.

Population figures taken from 1930 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator believe that if there were no discrimination practiced in employment, and Negroes had as good jobs as whites have, the discrepancy to which the Senator has referred might be changed? Does he not believe that the conditions to which he has referred result from discrimination against the employment of Negroes? Is it not true that Negroes are much poorer than white people are, and do not have the income which white people have?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe so, because the figures which I have given not only relates to the Negroes in the city of Cincinnati but to all the poor white folks there as well. If Cincinnati does not have any poor white folk, she is an unusual city.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator knows that in most cities the average income of Negroes is considerably lower than the average income of white people.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could that fact account for the proportion of murders and other crimes to which I have referred?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that discrimination in employment makes it very difficult for colored people to make their living in honest ways, and causes them to turn to crime. There are other causes involved, but I think that the condition which I have pointed out is one of the causes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator. I presented figures which relate to not only the seven or eight classes of crimes which I mentioned, but practically all crimes. It is true that the ratio as between whites and Negroes is not so great as that which I have just indicated in connection with the city of Cincinnati, but the figures do show that as between the North and the South the proportion of Negroes of the South who are incarcerated in jails, prisons, and reformatories, is much less than in the case of the Negroes of the North.

As I pointed out on many occasions we treat the Negroes of the South much better than the people of the North treat them. As the Administrator of FEPC, created under Executive order, testified last year, only 10 percent of the complaints come from the South and yet we are being charged with discrimination against them. The fact that we treat them better than northern folks may account for fewer crimes among them than those of the North.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILL AND TO SUBMIT NOTICES TO SUSPEND THE RULE

During the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's speech,

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me to make a unanimous consent request about reporting an appropriation bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. If it will not take me off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Committee on Appropriations has agreed to the independent offices appropriation bill, but it cannot physically report it at this moment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be reported as of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a further request. There are two items about which there will have to be motions to suspend the rules in order that they may be considered. I ask unanimous consent that I may give notice now of the request to suspend the rules so that these items may be in order when the bill is considered, if it should be considered tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair explain to the Senator from Oregon the effect of the unanimous consent request made by

the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, if it shall be agreed to, upon the debate which is now taking place in the Senate? I assure the Senator that I want to accommodate him, but I desire to make certain that I understand what effect it will have on the debate now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will have no effect upon the matter now pending before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Chair put the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, the request is granted.

Subsequently,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5201) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 926) thereon.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H. R. 5201, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 4, after line 7, insert the following:

"EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT"

"Emergency fund for the President: Not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the appropriation 'Emergency fund for the President,' contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented and amended, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a Budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5201, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H. R. 5201, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 14, after line 4, insert the following:

"The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to accept payment, at par and accrued interest, of any obligations, held by him, of States or other public bodies or non-profit corporations, notwithstanding the maturity dates or any premiums for the redemption thereof."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5201, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

STARVATION CONDITIONS IN EUROPE

During the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield if I do not lose my rights to the floor by doing so.

Mr. WHERRY. I hold in my hand an article published in the New York Times. It is under the date line of Washington, February 6. The headline is: "One hundred and forty million in Europe get only 2,000 calories a day."

The article states that according to estimates made in a report made by the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, which is an intergovernmental body under the chairmanship of Philip Noel-Baker of Great Britain, and members of which are Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States, more than 140,000,000 persons in Europe will have to live on an average total diet of 2,000 calories a day for the next few months, and that about 100,000,000 will be receiving an average of 1,500 calories or less per person. The report certainly is convincing evidence of the truth of the statements which have been made on the floor by nearly a dozen Senators who are interested in having food furnished to the starving people of Europe, that millions face starvation in Europe this winter.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the New York Times printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY MILLION IN EUROPE TO GET ONLY 2,000 CALORIES A DAY—ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORTS 100,000,000 WILL HAVE TO LIVE ON 1,500 UNITS OR LESS—HIGHER DIETS EXPECTED FOR BRITAIN

WASHINGTON, February 6.—More than 140,000,000 persons will have to live on an average total diet of 2,000 calories a day in Europe for the next few months and about 100,000,000 will be receiving an average of 1,500 calories or less per person, according to estimates made in a report made tonight by the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe.

An average of 2,000 calories is regarded as a minimum for safety. The estimates take into account all home-grown and imported food supplies available or in sight.

While the study upon which the estimates were made covered only calories, adequate supplies of other nutritional elements, such as proteins, fats, vitamins, and minerals which are also essential, are even a less satisfactory prospect than are calories.

It was pointed out that an average diet of 2,650 calories in addition to necessary

quantities of other nutritional elements has been recommended by the UNRRA Food Committee as necessary for full health and efficiency. The report warned:

"A serious gap between food supplies and minimum requirements remains for many millions of people in Europe."

The Emergency Committee is an intergovernmental body under the chairmanship of Philip Noel-Baker of Great Britain. Members are Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States.

TEXT OF THE REPORT

Following is the text of the report of the committee:

"The Emergency Economic Committee for Europe has reviewed such information as is available to it about the levels of food consumption in European countries, with the object of estimating the diet in terms of calories which an average person in each country might expect to receive in the course of the next few months.

"The information on which this study is based is incomplete. In some cases it has been necessary to use information obtained through nonofficial channels.

"In all cases the future position has been forecast in terms of prospects as they appeared early in January so that changes in the food outlook which may have taken place since then are not taken into account. Thus, much of the information on which the forecasts have been based is subject to an appreciable margin of error.

"Nevertheless, the committee considers that its review presents a substantially correct broad picture of the prospective food position in the countries covered."

ONE HUNDRED MILLION AT ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED CALORIES

"The broad picture that emerges after taking into account all home-grown and imported food supplies available or in sight, is that over the next few months over 140,000,000 people in the European countries reviewed will have to continue to live on a diet which provides an average of less than 2,000 calories a day. (See footnote 1.)

"Specifically the committee has found that:

"(A) About 100,000,000 people in the following groups will probably be receiving an average total diet of 1,500 calories per person per day or less:

"(I) The nonfarm population of Austria (74 percent); (see footnote 2), (The nonfarm population in the United States and United Kingdom zones and in Vienna are currently receiving somewhat over 1,500 calories, but most recent information indicates that rations may have to be reduced, thereby bringing the diet of the nonfarm population in all zones of Austria under 1,500 calories.)

"(II) The farm populations of tobacco growing regions in Bulgaria (9 percent).

"(III) German residents in Czechoslovakia (insofar as they do not qualify for Czechoslovak citizenship) (16 percent).

"(IV) The nonfarm population of eastern Slovakia (3 percent).

"(V) The nonfarm population of Finland (43 percent).

"(VI) The nonfarm population of Germany (75 percent). (The nonfarm population in the United States and United Kingdom zones, in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic zones with certain groups excepted, and in Berlin are currently receiving somewhat over 1,500 calories, but most recent information indicates that rations may have to be reduced, thereby bringing the diet of the nonfarm population in all zones under 1,500 calories.)

"(VII) The nonfarm population of Hungary; especially Budapest (50 percent).

FOR ITALY 59 PERCENT

"(VIII) The nonfarm population of Italy (59 percent).

"(IX) The nonfarm population of Rumania (30 percent).

"(X) The nonfarm population of Spain (40 percent) may also be in this category.

"(B) A further 40,000,000 people will probably be receiving an average total diet of over 1,500 but less than 2,000 calories including:

"(I) The nonfarm population of France (65 percent) (see footnote 2).

"(II) The nonfarm population of Bohemia and Moravia and western Slovakia (50 percent).

"(III) The nonfarm population of Greece (47 percent).

"(IV) The farm and nonfarm population of certain districts of Yugoslavia (33 percent).

"(C) An average of a bare 2,000 calories per day appears to be in prospect for the nonfarm population of Luxembourg and possibly Portugal. Somewhat higher diets still under 2,500 calories may be anticipated for the nonfarm populations of Belgium, Bulgaria, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland (with certain groups at lower levels), and Yugoslavia.

"(D) Average diets of over 2,500 calories will be available only for the nonfarm populations of Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom and farm populations of all countries except where otherwise noted above.

"It should be noted that the above classification excludes entirely Albania, Eire, Turkey, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for which no definite information on the food situation was available to the committee.

"While this study is in terms of calories only, as a convenient indicator of the level of food supply, adequate supplies of other nutritional elements—proteins, fats, vitamins, and minerals—are also essential.

"In general, current and prospective European diets are even less satisfactory in other nutritional elements and in palatability than they are in calories.

"As a guide to the possible nutritional and economic effects of the diet levels described in this review, it may be noted that a diet containing an average of about 2,650 calories per day, in addition to necessary quantities of other nutritional elements, has been recommended by the UNRRA Food Committee as the amount of food sufficient to maintain full health and efficiency in a population with a normal distribution according to sex, age, and occupation.

"Prewar diets in some countries in southern and eastern Europe did not reach this level, however, while diets in northwestern European countries were generally at levels somewhat above this standard.

"An average diet of around 2,000 calories has been generally recognized in military and civilian relief planning as a minimum level below which there would be marked effects on ability to work and danger of the development of disease and unrest associated with food shortage.

"These effects become progressively more serious as the diet is reduced down to and below 1,500 calories and the period of low diet is prolonged.

SERIOUS GAP FOR MILLIONS

"Thus a serious gap between food supplies and minimum requirements remains for many millions of people in Europe even after the vigorous efforts to alleviate the position which have been, and are being, made by the governments and international agencies concerned have been taken into account."

Footnote 1. It is emphasized that the division of various groups of the population of Europe into broad diet categories is based on the estimated prospective average level of the total diet of the group concerned. Within any group the actual consumption of different individuals may vary from starvation to fully adequate levels.

Footnote 2. The percentage figures shown in parenthesis are an estimate of the proportion of the total population of the country concerned which is in the particular group listed. Thus, about 74 percent of the total population of Austria are estimated to be in the nonfarm population group.

ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE ARMY

During the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's speech:

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, if by so doing so he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, an editorial was published in The State, of Columbia, S. C., the issue of Tuesday, February 5, 1946, entitled "Adjutant General of the Army." It relates to the nomination of Maj. Gen. E. F. Witsell to be Adjutant General of the Army and to the confirmation of his nomination. We in South Carolina are fortunate in having one of our distinguished native sons elevated to the position of Adjutant General of the Army. We are indeed proud that he has been selected for this most important position.

General Witsell is a man of outstanding character and ability. He has a long and glorious war record. Furthermore, Mr. President, he is a man with a heart, a man who understands human nature and the problems of the GI. I think the United States of America is particularly fortunate in having such a distinguished gentleman as Adjutant General of the Army.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE ARMY

In the State Sunday we carried the news that Maj. Gen. E. F. Witsell had been confirmed as Adjutant General of the Army. For some time, ever since the illness of General Ullo, General Witsell has been Acting Adjutant General, much of the heavy war work falling on his shoulders. He is a South Carolinian, a native of Charleston and a graduate of The Citadel. He is another man from this State who has made good in a big way, and this newspaper is pleased to note that he is no longer serving in an acting capacity but is now the Adjutant General of the Army.

APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE CHAIR ON CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the appeal of Mr. BARKLEY from the decision of the Chair sustaining the point of order of Mr. RUSSELL that, under the rule, the presentation of the cloture motion on the FEPC bill was not in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, without taking him off the floor, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me in order that I may make the point of no quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky, with the understanding as stated?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Billbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, on the same conditions heretofore stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might advise the Senator from Louisiana that it will be necessary ultimately for him to yield the floor, but I think there will be no difficulty about that.

Mr. President, I always try to be frank with the Senate in the matter of its procedure and the consideration of legislation. We have now been for some 3 weeks considering the parliamentary and legislative situation involving Senate bill 101, and the effort to bring it to a vote. The Senator is familiar with the procedure up to the present, which involves the approval of the Journal of the 17th of January, and then later involves an appeal from the decision of the Chair on a ruling made last week when I made an effort to file a petition for cloture to bring to a close the debate on Senate bill 101.

Under the rules of the Senate the motion to amend the Journal, as well as the motion to approve the Journal, is debatable, and can be debated indefinitely unless some method is devised to close debate on the motion. An appeal from the decision of the Chair is likewise debatable, and can be debated indefinitely unless some method be found to close debate on that. Therefore we now have a double-barreled situation, so that two propositions which are debatable indefinitely might be before the Senate before we could file a petition for cloture on Senate bill 101, unless in the meantime a method might be found by which debate could be terminated on the appeal from the decision of the Chair in the first instance, in the second instance on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] to amend the Journal, and, I might say, in the third instance on the motion to approve the Journal. All that has to be cleared away as underbrush before we can get back

to the main proposition of the consideration of Senate bill 101.

As I indicated a few days ago, and as I still believe, the test of the ability of the Senate to bring about a vote on Senate bill 101 depends upon our ability to carry by the required two-thirds majority a motion to close debate under rule XXII. Unless we can reach a posture in the parliamentary situation where we can get a vote on that, we cannot get a vote on the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, under these circumstances it seems to me wise to get a vote on the cloture motion so that we may know where we are. In order to get a vote on the cloture motion it is necessary that I withdraw my appeal from the decision of the Chair on the ruling of a few days ago, it is necessary for the Senator from North Carolina to withdraw his amendment to the Journal, and it will then be necessary to approve the Journal, so that a motion for cloture can be filed.

Believing, as I do, and as I think a majority on both sides believes, that it is essential that we get a vote on cloture so that we can determine whether we can ever get a vote on the bill, I have determined to withdraw my appeal from the decision of the Chair, after conference with both sides, with the Senator from North Carolina, and with those who oppose and those who support Senate bill 101, without prejudice in any way insofar as the merits of the interpretation of rule XXII may be concerned, because I think the time will come, in connection with some legislation, when the Senate must either interpret what it meant when it adopted rule XXII, or it must amend the rule so that we will not find ourselves in an impasse where we cannot function.

So, without prejudice to the right to bring that question before the Senate at any appropriate time, either for interpretation, or an amendment to the rule, I have decided to withdraw my appeal from the decision of the Chair, because I think that is an essential first step to getting a vote of the Senate not only on the motion for cloture, but on the right to file it under the ruling of the Chair.

Therefore, Mr. President, under those conditions, I now withdraw my appeal from the decision of the Chair holding that the petition for closing debate which I offered a few days ago could not be filed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator says "without prejudice." I wonder if he will explain to me what he means by that; because it seems to me that one of the real dangers of this situation is that a record is now being made of a ruling of the Chair which some of us believe to be an erroneous ruling—and I say that with all respect to the Chair—and in my opinion, a record has not been made as yet, with full adequacy, of the cons of that ruling. If the Senator from Kentucky now withdraws his appeal it seems to me that we are running a very serious danger of establishing a precedent which may be used on the floor of

the Senate on a future occasion, just as other precedents were cited in the very able statement—although I do not agree with it—which the President pro tempore made on Monday last when he ruled on the question which had been raised. I do not think the precedents cited are applicable to the situation before the Senate, and I regret that the appeal is going to be withdrawn, unless there can be presented a much more complete statement of the opposite point of view on the ruling of the Chair.

I will be perfectly frank with the Senator from Kentucky. I have an argument which I desire to make on the ruling of the Chair. At the same time I do not want to take the time of the Senate this afternoon to make the argument if it can be understood that, for the purpose of the RECORD, I shall be able to make the argument—shall we say, tomorrow, at a time when most of the Senators are having lunch, and therefore will not be inconvenienced?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not impose on the Senator from Oregon the requirement that he make his speech while Senators are at lunch. But I wish to say, and I intended to say, that in withdrawing the appeal at this time from this specific ruling, with which I disagree sincerely and conscientiously, because I believe that if the Senate maintains that ruling it in effect nullifies the cloture rule, rule XXII, so we might never get to a point where we could even file a petition for cloture, which certainly was not intended by the Senate when it adopted rule XXII, that in withdrawing the appeal I yield nothing of my view upon that subject. I do not accept the ruling, so far as I am concerned, as a precedent, because I would reserve the same right at any other time, when a ruling is made under the provision of rule XXII, which is involved here, to ask the Senate to interpret its own rule, that I have asserted in taking the appeal in this instance. I am withdrawing my appeal now in order that we may get to a vote on cloture, which, as I see it, is the test at this time of our ability to bring the pending bill to a vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear as to my position, may I remind the Senator from Kentucky that I have had much to say on the floor of the Senate in recent days about the question of majority rule? I happen to believe in it. I am perfectly aware that my opposition, or my inability to agree with the procedure which is about to be followed, represents a decidedly minority opinion, and I do not think it would be at all sportsmanlike for me to raise any technical objection that I might raise at this time, or make an objection myself, or proceed at this time to make the arguments on the ruling of the Chair which I think ought to be made for the RECORD. Hence I shall not resort to any of those techniques, but I do want to serve notice—and I should like to have it understood—that tomorrow at some hour when I do not feel that I would be interfering too much with the business of the Senate, I do want to set forth for the RECORD the reasons why I think the ruling of the Chair from which the Sen-

ator from Kentucky appealed, was an erroneous ruling, so that the RECORD may show the basis on which I make my statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say to the Senator from Oregon that I contemplate at the appropriate time, in order that the Senate may have it under consideration, to make a rather detailed argument myself with respect to the purpose of rule XXII. I certainly would not do it tomorrow. I do not know that the Senator means that he makes that as a condition upon which we are proceeding now.

Mr. MORSE. Decidedly not.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, the Senator can make his argument at any time when it is appropriate to do so. And I think I will find myself in agreement with the basis of his argument, because I feel very deeply about the rule under which we are now proceeding, or attempting to proceed, or are prevented from proceeding. But I think at some appropriate time, when we are not laboring under such conditions as now prevail here, there ought to be a thorough threshing out of the intention of the Senate when it adopted rule XXII, and the meaning of that rule within any reasonable interpretation.

Mr. MORSE. May I make very clear to the Senator from Kentucky that my statement as to my desire to present an argument tomorrow in no way refers to any condition precedent to any proceeding the Senate follows this afternoon. At the same time I should not want the RECORD to be closed today in such a way that anyone would gain from it the impression that I find myself in agreement with the procedure or that I think the ruling of the Chair the other day is a correct ruling.

Mr. President, I believe I can put it in this way: There are two things I am trying to do. I am trying to demonstrate that I am endeavoring to cooperate with doing business, so far as the Senate is concerned, when I discover that I am in such a minority as I am in this instance. In the second place, I want to show my complete disagreement with the ruling of the Chair and the procedure being followed by making an argument respecting my position at a later hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is why I stated, in withdrawing the appeal, that I did it without prejudice to any principle involved, and without yielding in any way my views in regard to the ruling from which I appealed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Taking cognizance of the remark made by the Senator from Oregon respecting the rule of the majority, may I inquire of the able majority leader whether the rules of the Senate were adopted by a majority or minority vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think anything is adopted here, including the rules, without a majority vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want only to express my agreement with the Senator from Kentucky. I understand the RECORD will

show that the present occupant of the chair believes the rule to be one thing and the majority leader, and those of us who support him, believe it to be another, but that the actual decision as to what the rule means will be left to a later date, the Senator from Kentucky having accomplished the purpose of securing, by agreement, a vote on cloture.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that is not the stipulation at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not the stipulation at all. I would not sit here and allow a statement of that kind to go into the Record unchallenged. That is not the parliamentary situation at all.

Mr. TAFT. The point I wish to make is that the Senator from Kentucky, in moving to dismiss his appeal, is not admitting the correctness of the ruling.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated that.

Mr. TAFT. In joining with the Senator from Kentucky in his move to dismiss the appeal, I also do not concur in the correctness of the ruling. I expressed my opinion on the ruling on February 4, as is to be found in the Record, and I merely wish to say that in concurring with the dismissal of the appeal I do not wish to indicate that I have in any way changed my opinion expressed at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. All I wish to say is that I do not yield my views in regard to the interpretation of rule XXII, and that in withdrawing my appeal I do not forego the right at some future and more appropriate time to bring in question the principle involved in the rule. It would probably be on some other legislation, but I did not mean to infer that the decision of the Senate on the ruling, and on the interpretation of that rule, is deferred to some later date, because that could not be done, and I did not mean that to be the interpretation of my remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make a statement for the Record. Since statements are being made which are critical of the ruling of the Chair, I wish to state that there are those of us in this body who are as conscientious as any Senator who has spoken, who believe that the ruling of the Chair was not only eminently correct, but in view of the precedents of this body, was the only ruling that could be made without doing violence to the rules which have been adopted.

Mr. President, if the rules of the Senate do not conform to the ideas of Senators as to what they should be, let Senators offer amendments to the rules in the regular way. I say that those of us who believe that the ruling of the Chair was correct, who heard the precedents which were read from the Record, are convinced that the ruling of the Chair was not only correct, but the only ruling that could have been made without striking down the rules of the Senate adopted for its own guidance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in stating my views I, of course, did not remotely mean to cast any reflection on the sincerity or earnestness of any other Senator who takes a different view. If it were not for the difference which exists among lawyers as to what the law is in any case involving the rights of people, the legal profession would go out of business; it would not be needed. Lawyers who take different sides of a question in the courts or elsewhere, and in interpreting the law, are accorded as much sincerity as anyone. And I accord that sincerity to all Members of this body, regardless of their opinion. I do not, however, want my withdrawal of the appeal to be interpreted to mean that I have changed my views with respect to the proper interpretation of the rule. I accord to all Senators equal sincerity with myself, and I accord to the distinguished Presiding Officer entire sincerity in the decision which he rendered.

With that, Mr. President, I now withdraw the appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has the right to withdraw his appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and has done so.

The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] to amend the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, January 17, 1946.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the serious and extended consideration which the Senate has given to my amendment for approximately 2 weeks; but since it has not been adopted, I ask leave to withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to withdraw it, and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal about which we have been debating be approved. I wish to announce that following that I shall offer the cloture petition which I attempted to offer the other day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, January 17, 1946, is approved.

The Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion under rule XXII, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair will designate the clerk to read the motion. The Chair believes that the rule provides that the Chair shall read it. The Chair asks unanimous consent that the clerk may read it. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PETITION FOR CLOTURE

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby

move to bring to a close the debate upon the bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry":

DENNIS CHAVEZ, JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, CHARLES C. GOSSETT, JAMES W. HUFFMAN, HARLEY M. KILGORE, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, SCOTT W. LUCAS, GLEN TAYLOR, ABE MURDOCK, JAS. M. MEAD, FRANCIS J. MYERS, FRANK P. BRIGGS, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, ROBERT F. WAGNER, BRIEN MCMAHON, DAVID I. WALSH, ELBERT D. THOMAS, CLAUDE PEPPER, ELMER THOMAS, JAMES E. MURRAY, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, HUGH B. MITCHELL, JAMES M. TUNNELL, FORREST C. DONNELL, WAYNE MORSE, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, W. A. STANFILL, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., HUGH BUTLER, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, B. J. HICKENLOOPER, RAYMOND R. WILLIS, ROBT. A. TAFT, WILLIAM LANGER, GUY CORDON, OWEN BREWSTER, HOMER FERGUSON, ARTHUR CAPPER, CHAS. W. TOBEY, KENNETH S. WHERRY, CLYDE M. REED, HOMER E. CAPEHART, JOSEPH H. BALL, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, THOS. C. HART, GEORGE D. AIKEN, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rule the Senate would be required to vote 1 hour after the Senate meets on the second day after the filing of the cloture petition, which would be Saturday at 1 o'clock p. m.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] the author of the bill, who has been in charge of it, is now ill at his home with a severe cold, and is unable to be present today. I am speaking for him, after conferring with him. Because of a situation which exists in his domestic household, because of the fact that his daughter is to be married at 12 o'clock on Saturday, he asks, and I ask, unanimous consent that instead of voting at 1 o'clock on Saturday, the vote be taken at 4 o'clock p. m. I ask unanimous consent that instead of voting at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., under the rule, we vote at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that instead of voting at 1 o'clock p. m. on Saturday on the petition for cloture, the hour for the vote be fixed at 4 o'clock p. m. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following the petition for cloture which has just been presented under the rule, are amendments to Senate bill 101 now in order to be offered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may offer such amendments, so that they may be read before the vote to bring the debate to a close.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If they are offered now, or before 4 o'clock on Saturday, may they then be debated after 4 o'clock on Saturday, provided the motion for cloture is adopted at that time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it can be done within the limitation of the rule, which allows 1 hour's debate for each Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I then offer at this time, without discussion, two amendments which are printed under my name, and designated as amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and filed, to be taken up under the conditions named.

Without objection, they will be considered in compliance with the rule, and printed in the RECORD.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. SALTONSTALL are as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SALTONSTALL to the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, viz: On page 7, after line 7, strike out lines 8 to 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, shall cause prompt investigation to be made in connection therewith; and if the Commission shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complaint, it shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Neither the Commission nor any officer or employee of the Commission shall disclose what has transpired in the course of such endeavors.

"In the case of failure so to eliminate such practice, or in advance thereof if in the judgment of the Commission, circumstances so warrant, the Commission shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SALTONSTALL to the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, viz: On page 8, beginning with line 10, strike out down through and including line 16, on page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) or, if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application might be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States, within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, including questions of fact and questions of law, and shall have power to

grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission. The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or designated referee, agent, or agency, the court may take and consider such additional evidence. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission; and the findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall in like manner be conclusive.

"(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(h) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously, and if possible within 10 days after they have been docketed."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does not the rule require that amendments may not be considered, if cloture is defeated, unless they have been presented and read prior to the decision on cloture?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If cloture is defeated, there will be no limitation at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. If cloture is defeated, the bill will stand in the same relationship as though cloture had never been voted upon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I ask, if cloture is sustained, may amendments be debated which have not been presented and read prior to the time of the decision on cloture?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the ruling just made by the Chair, I now offer and send to the desk a substitute amendment to Senate bill 101. I ask for a ruling that it complies with the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Fair Employment Practice Act.'

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(a) That the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of race, religious creed, or color is contrary to the principles of freedom and equality of opportunity upon which this Nation is built, is incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

"(b) That it is the policy of the United States to bring about the elimination of discrimination because of race, religious creed, or color in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government.

"UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

"(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

"(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

"(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

"(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of persons for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against persons because of their race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

"(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

"(2) to expel from membership any person because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

"(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, or employee because of such person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union with-

in the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

"SCOPE OF ACT

"SEC. 4. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ 50 or more persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof or performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party, awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated as hereinafter provided in section 8 of this act.

"(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has 50 or more members who are engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce or employed by the United States or any Territory, insular possession, or instrumentality thereof.

"(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices of the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that subsection (b) of section 6, providing for enforcement by the courts, shall not apply in any case of any department or independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act shall make a report to the President, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the President to take such measures as he deems appropriate to prevent such department or agency from engaging in an unfair employment practice.

"FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'), which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

"(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(d) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

"(e) When three members of the Commission have qualified and taken office, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said committee shall then be transferred to and become employees of the Commission, and all records, papers, and property of the committee shall then pass into the possession of the commission.

"(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may

designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

"(g) The Commission shall have power—

"(1) to appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist in the performance of its functions;

"(2) to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services;

"(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

"(4) to issue from time to time, such regulations as it deems necessary to regulate its own procedure and the appearance of persons before it, and to amend or rescind, from time to time, any such regulation whenever it deems such amendment or rescission necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(5) to serve process or other papers of the Commission, either personally, by registered mail, or by leaving a copy at the principal office or place of business of the person to be served; and

"(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to bring about the removal of discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership, because of race, religious creed, or color—

"(1) by making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the effect of such discrimination, and of the best methods of eliminating it;

"(2) by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

"(3) by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

"(4) by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

"(5) by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

"(6) by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties in any such case as to ways and means for the elimination of any such discrimination.

"(b) Whenever the Commission finds that any person has engaged in any unfair employment practice within the scope of this act and that the Commission is unable to eliminate such unfair employment practice by use of the means specified in subsection (a), the Commission may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States for an order enjoining such person from engaging in such unfair employment practice; and upon a showing by the Commission that such person has engaged in or is about to engage in such unfair employment practice, the court may grant without bond a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order prohibiting such person from engaging in such practice.

"(c) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has

conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered, and the other work performed by it, and shall make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as it deems necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 7. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person relating to any such investigation proceeding, or hearing.

"(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations, proceedings, or hearings.

"(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof.

"(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"SEC. 8. (a) All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated by them, except such classes of contracts as may be exempted from the scope of this provision by regulations of the Commission, a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

"(b) No contract shall be awarded or executed by the United States or any agency

thereof to any person found by the Commission to have violated any such provision of such a contract or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, for a period to be fixed by the Commission not to exceed 3 years from the date when the Commission determines such violation to have occurred. The Commission may by subsequent order, for good cause shown, reduce any period so fixed. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of such persons."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say, in regard to the printing of the substitute, that as it was printed last night a word which I had written in handwriting, "religious" is printed in the amendment as "religions." I should like to have a correction made, so that the word will read "religious."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Following the ruling of the Chair, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts offered his amendment. Do I correctly understand that if such amendments are not read, even though cloture should prevail, the amendments may not be debated after the vote on cloture is taken, without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless they have been presented and read by 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday or their reading waived by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Then is it in order that the amendments be read between now and the time the cloture petition is voted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct, unless the reading is waived.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By offering the amendments and sending them to the desk at this time, are not all the rules complied with, so that such amendments may be debated and presented for a vote after cloture is voted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator must present them now in order that they may be pending and argued after 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So all the rules have been complied with.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments which have been offered or may be offered before 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday be considered as having been offered in compliance with the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have the request stated?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that all amendments which have

been offered or may be offered between now and 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday be considered as having been offered in compliance with the rule, which means that they will be pending if cloture should be agreed to. As the Senator knows, under the rule they may not be offered after the vote on cloture, if cloture should be adopted, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am well aware of that. But is the Senator asking that any amendment may be sent to the desk, without Senators being apprised of the contents?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I mean any amendments offered from the floor during sessions of the Senate, up until 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as having been offered under the rule, and in compliance with the rule. I think that is the rule anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is as badly in error in that respect as he is in regard to the ruling of the Chair. The rule provides that amendments must be offered and read.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming that we have a favorable vote on cloture, if any Senator wishes to debate an amendment, must not the amendment have been presented and read prior to the vote on cloture?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, it must have been presented prior to that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not mean to obviate the necessity of reading the amendment. I think that is what the rule means. I did not mean to abrogate the rule by asking that a Senator be permitted merely to send his amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to change his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BARKLEY. If that was the impression I gave, it was an erroneous impression. I ask unanimous consent that all amendments presented and read under the rule, up until 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, be regarded as having been offered in compliance with the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, have not the rules been complied with so that the amendments which I have offered may be debated and voted upon after 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator has complied with the rule.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is not the Senator's right to debate his amendment, assuming that cloture is adopted, conditioned upon unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; he has 1 hour, which he may use in any way he desires.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I note that rule XXII provides as follows:

Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

Perhaps I did not make my question clear. I ask the Chair, would not consent be required under those circumstances?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not to debate the amendment, but only to offer a new amendment that had not been previously read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not certain that I am clear on the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. SALTONSTALL). As I understand, he has presented his amendment, but the amendment has not yet been read. My question is, Will an opportunity be given between now and 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday for the amendments which have been sent to the desk to be read, so that they will comply with the rule?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A special agreement was made about the two amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts. He requested unanimous consent that they might be offered and considered as read; and, under the rule, he is entitled to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If other amendments are offered between now and the hour at which we are to vote on the cloture motion, will there have to be a special agreement as to them?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, they would have to be read; but the rule may be waived and the amendment printed in the Record, which would be deemed as a compliance with the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Would there have to be unanimous consent to that effect?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; they can be offered and read prior to 4 o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to 4 o'clock on Saturday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, under the rule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few moments ago I submitted and sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 101. I was laboring under the impression that the unanimous-consent agreement obtained by the majority leader would not make it necessary for me to request between now and 4 o'clock on Saturday that my amendment in the nature of a substitute be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the Senator's amendment was waived—which makes it in compliance with the rule.

Mr. MORSE. That puts my amendment in the same position as that of the

amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts; does it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Exactly.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL—STATUS OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the House has adopted the conference report on Senate bill 380, commonly known as the full employment bill. I hope that tomorrow there may be an opportunity to bring the conference report to the attention of the Senate and have it disposed of.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I request that as in executive session, it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William S. Tyson, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor of Labor, Department of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, as in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Henry A. Mulligan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946 (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to have it understood, in accordance with the agreement with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that when the Senator from Louisiana yielded to me he did not lose the floor, and that that understanding will apply to the session tomorrow, no less than to the session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana will hold the floor.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 8, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY CHIEF OF ORDNANCE

Maj. Gen. Everett Strait Hughes (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Lt. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr., who retires on May 31, 1946.

TO BE ASSISTANTS TO THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, WITH THE RANK OF BRIGADIER GENERAL, FOR A PERIOD OF 4 YEARS FROM DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

Maj. Gen. Gladeon Marcus Barnes (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Earl McFarland, United States Army, retired.

Maj. Gen. Henry Benton Saylor (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Charles Tillman Harris, Jr.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

J. Watt Page for appointment as State director of selective service for Texas under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of selective service for Texas will be at the rate of \$7,175 per annum.

Vivian B. Collins for appointment as State director of selective service for Florida under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of selective service for Florida will be at the rate of \$5,600 per annum.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 7 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William S. Tyson to be Solicitor of Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, the giver of all good, lead us to those spiritual heights where our very loftiness of thought and feeling become our best defense. Here we behold the Christ, waiting with long patience to unvell the face of God; here

we learn that he who exalteth himself shall be humbled, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

O keep Thou the springs of our national life unpolluted and cause us to understand that intellect alone cannot solve our problems. We pray that more of the human heart may enter into the rigor of toil, the drudgery of service, and the harshness of law. Not by might, not by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord; otherwise the lamp of hope burns low and the stars grow dim. As there is no wealth but life, O vitalize us anew with this great force, lest we become mere reformers and temporal opportunists, rather than custodians of a day destined to move upward and onward. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of H. R. 4908.

The Clerk read the engrossed bill, as follows:

H. R. 4908

An act to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "Labor Disputes Act, 1946."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that labor disputes affecting the public interest should be settled fairly and, so far as possible, without interruption or delay in the production and distribution necessary to the public interest, and to that end it is the duty of both employers and employees to bargain in good faith. The right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers is one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened. Government is no less the guardian of the general welfare than of individual freedom. In a complex society warfare in one section of industry affects many others.

Government decision should not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved. Demands of either labor or management should be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness, and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.

The desired end of bargaining between management and labor is a contract. Once that contract is made, it must be equally binding and enforceable on both parties. Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence or unlawful possession, obstruction, or destruction of property. Collective bargaining requires that labor be on one side of the table and management on the other. The separate positions, responsibilities, duties, powers, and rights of labor and management must be maintained.

Legislation has heretofore been enacted to guarantee the right of collective bargaining. It is equally important that legislation be enacted to protect the rights of labor, industry, and the general public in the processes of collective bargaining. Wrongful and

unlawful conduct on either side is destructive of collective bargaining; and conduct in pursuit of objectives that are not proper and legitimate objectives of collective bargaining and which are detrimental to the interests of the general public are likewise destructive of collective bargaining. The use of force, violence, and compulsion are declared to be against public policy, as they violate the principles of freedom and self-government upon which our Government was formed and the purposes for which it was founded.

To aid in the voluntary and expeditious settlement of labor disputes affecting the public interest, therefore, there are hereby established additional facilities and procedures for the application of collective bargaining, conciliation, mediation, and arbitration.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MEDIATION BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) Membership: There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a board to be known as the Labor-Management Mediation Board (in this act called the Board), which shall be composed of six or more members appointed by the President, as the President from time to time finds that the work of the Board requires. The Board shall consist of a number of members representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a number of disinterested members representative of the public (in this act called, respectively, employer members, employee members, and public members). The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and secretary of the Board from among the public members. The terms of the first Chairman, Vice Chairman, and secretary shall begin as soon as they qualify, and expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one on February 1, 1948, one on February 1, 1949, and one on February 1, 1950. The terms of office of all successors shall expire 3 years after the expiration of the terms for which their predecessors were appointed; but any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. The President is also authorized to appoint such number of alternate public members, alternate employer members, and alternate employee members as he deems appropriate, subject to salary appropriations approved by the Congress. Upon designation by the Chairman, an alternate member may serve upon the panels provided for in section 6, and may serve as a substitute for any absent regular member in the same representative group, with full power to act as a regular member of the Board.

(b) Terms and salaries: The members and alternate members, other than the Chairman and Vice Chairman, shall be appointed for such terms and shall receive such compensation for their services as the President shall, from time to time, determine. The Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$12,000 per annum; the Vice Chairman and the secretary shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum.

(c) Meetings: The Board shall meet on call of the Chairman or on the written request of a majority of the Board filed with the secretary. In the absence of the Chairman of the Board, the Vice Chairman shall be authorized to act as Chairman. The Chairman shall designate some public member or alternate public member of the Board to act as Chairman in the absence of both the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Two members or alternate members from each representative group shall constitute a quorum of the Board. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) Organization powers: The Board is authorized to employ and fix the compensa-

tion of such officers and employees not otherwise provided for, as may be necessary, within appropriations made therefor by the Congress. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services and, with the approval of the President, the services and facilities of, such other departments and agencies of the Government as may from time to time be needed. The Board may delegate to any public member or alternate public member or to an executive secretary such administrative duties relating to the internal management of the Board's affairs as it may deem appropriate: *Provided, however*, This provision shall not apply to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Federal Social Security Agency, or any other department or agency of the Government which holds as confidential any and all information submitted to it.

(e) Office of the Board: The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers in any other place.

(f) The National Mediation Board created by the Railway Labor Act, as amended by the act approved June 21, 1934 (Public No. 442, 73d Cong.), shall hereafter be known as the National Carrier Mediation Board.

DUTIES OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 4. (a) Employers, employees, and their respective representatives shall have the following duties in the public interest:

(1) Duty of employer: It shall be the duty of an employer to refrain from conducting a lock-out until after the expiration of 5 days from the date on which such employer or his representative has given to the Chairman of the Board the written notice of his intention so to do, containing a statement of his reasons for such intended lock-out; and if the Board within such 5 days assumes jurisdiction of the dispute, it shall be the duty of the employer to refrain from conducting the intended lock-out until after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the notice.

(2) Duty of employees: It shall be the duty of employees of an employer to refrain from striking until after the expiration of 5 days from the date on which they, or their representatives, have given to the Chairman of the Board written notice of their intention so to do, containing a statement of their reasons for such intended strike; and if within such 5 days the Board assumes jurisdiction of the dispute, it shall be the duty of the employees to refrain from striking until after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the notice.

(3) It shall be the duty both of employers, their employees, and their respective representatives, to withhold giving the notices provided for in this section until after other available conciliation and mediation procedures have been attempted, and the notices shall state what has been tried.

(b) For the purposes of this section "employer" does not include any person who regularly has in his employ less than 250 individuals.

JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. The Chairman, Vice Chairman, and secretary shall determine, in the case of any labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act), whether such labor disputes is one which substantially obstructs or interferes with interstate or foreign commerce and affects the public interest and cannot be expeditiously adjusted by collective bargaining. If they so determine, the Board shall have jurisdiction of the dispute.

PROCEDURE FOR MEDIATION

SEC. 6. After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute, the Board, under the direction of the Chairman, shall make every reasonable effort to assist the parties to adjust and settle the dispute and make agreements

for that purpose. To such end, the Board may utilize, and the Chairman may designate, a mediation panel consisting exclusively of disinterested persons representative of the public, or consisting of one or more persons representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a disinterested person or persons representative of the public. The persons designated may be members of the Board, alternate members of the Board, or other persons named by the Board. The Chairman or mediation panel may at any time request the parties to a dispute to negotiate by collective bargaining or to meet with any representatives of the Board.

VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

SEC. 7. In the event a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or by mediation under section 6, the Chairman or the mediation panel shall endeavor to induce the parties to the dispute voluntarily to submit their differences to arbitration. If the parties consent to such arbitration, they shall file with the Board a notice of the agreement to arbitrate the dispute. The award of the arbitrator shall be filed with the Board and shall be binding upon all parties consenting to such arbitration.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO

SEC. 8. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 6, the Chairman, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, shall have the power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute, to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation which led to the dispute and which the Chairman deems shall be prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent nor shall any provision of such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Chairman shall determine, but shall in no event be effective for a longer period than 30 days from the date on which the Board took jurisdiction.

(c) The Attorney General, at the request of the Chairman, during such 30-day period of jurisdiction, shall petition any district court of the United States, in any State or in the District of Columbia, or the United States court of any Territory or possession, within the jurisdiction of which any person to whom an order is directed resides, transacts business, or is found, for the enforcement of such order, and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceedings, and shall have power, during, but not beyond, the Board's 30-day period of jurisdiction, to grant such temporary relief or restraining order and to make and enter a decree enforcing the order of the Chairman. Notice or process of the court under this section may be served in any judicial district, either personally or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person to be served. Petitions filed under this section shall be heard with all possible expedition. The judgment and decree of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals, or by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari.

(d) When granting temporary relief or restraining order, or making or entering a decree enforcing an order of the Chairman, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, except that sections 11 and 12 of such act shall apply in cases of contempt.

REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. The Board shall have authority, in conformity with the provisions of this act, from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it.

SEC. 9A. It shall be the further duty of the Board to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of both labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment, industrial peace, and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. The Board shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than June 30, 1946.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. Binding effect of collective-bargaining contracts: All collective-bargaining contracts shall be mutually and equally binding and enforceable against each of the parties thereto, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding. In the event of a breach of any such contract or of any agreement contained in such contract by either party thereto, then, in addition to any other remedy or remedies existing, a suit for damages for such breach may be maintained by the other party or parties in any State or United States district court having jurisdiction of the parties.

SEC. 11. Violence and intimidation: (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, by the use of force or violence or threats thereof, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of, or from accepting or refusing employment by, any employer, or from entering or leaving any place of employment of such employer. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, notwithstanding the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," to enjoin violations and threatened violations of any of the provisions of this section, and by appropriate order or decree to compel compliance with such provisions: *Provided*, said courts shall not issue an injunction against the right to strike, peaceful assembly, or peaceful picketing. Any individual who violates any of the provisions of this section shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act.

(b) An employee whom a preponderance of the testimony taken (in appropriate proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board) shows has willfully engaged in violence, intimidation, or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with a labor dispute involving his employer, or in connection with any organizational activities of a labor organization among employees of his employer, shall not be entitled to reinstatement by, or any back pay from, such employer under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 12. Supervisory employees: (a) As used in this section the term "supervisory employee" means an employee whose primary duties consist of—

(1) the direction or supervision of the activities of other employees but who regularly do no productive manual work; or

(2) the computation of the pay of other employees and does not include persons who are selected by productive workers under established practice; or

(3) the determination of the time worked by other employees, or the supervision or administration of the factors on the basis of which the pay of other employees is computed;

but does not include any employee within the purview of the Railway Labor Act.

(b) Hereafter no supervisory employee shall have the status of an "employee" for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 13. Boycott, and so forth: Whenever any act mentioned in this section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate or foreign commerce (a) it shall be unlawful (1) by means of a concerted refusal to use, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials produced or manufactured by any person, to induce or require or to attempt to induce or require another person to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization; or (2) by means of a concerted refusal to use, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials purchased, produced, manufactured, or used by an employer, to induce or require or to attempt to induce or require such employer to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, one labor organization instead of another labor organization with which such employer has an applicable collective-bargaining agreement; or (3) by means of a concerted refusal to use, handle, install, or otherwise deal with articles, materials, or parts thereof or tools produced or manufactured by a manufacturer or producer who has produced or manufactured said articles, materials, or parts thereof, and tools during the existence of a contract with a labor union certified to said manufacturer or producer by the National Labor Relations Board.

(b) Whoever violates the provisions of this section (1) shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act; (2) in case such violation is by a labor organization, such organization shall thereof cease to have and cease to be entitled to a status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, for a period of not less than 90 days, nor more than 6 months.

That notwithstanding the provisions of "an act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties may award either a restraining order or a temporary or permanent injunction restraining any violation of this section, where it shall affirmatively appear from the pleadings and evidence that irreparable injury will otherwise occur due to the perishable nature of the articles or materials referred to in subsection (a), including livestock and live poultry.

SEC. 14. Definitions: As used in this act—
(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

(b) The terms "employer," "employee," "representative," "labor organization," and "labor dispute" shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act. The term "agricultural labor" as used in section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act means any person employed in performing "agricultural labor" as that term is defined in section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

SEC. 15. If any part of this act shall be held unconstitutional, it shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of the act.

SEC. 16. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury any sums necessary to the purposes of this act not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the engrossed copy of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DOYLE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BULWINKLE (interrupting the further reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the engrossed copy of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Mr. BALDWIN of New York moves that the bill (H. R. 4908) be recommitted to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 155, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—258

Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Cox
Adams	Brown, Ohio	Cravens
Allen, Ill.	Brumbaugh	Crawford
Allen, La.	Bryson	Cunningham
Almond	Buck	Curtis
Andersen,	Buffett	Daughton, Va.
H. Carl	Bulwinkle	Dirksen
Anderson, Calif.	Burch	Dolliver
Andresen,	Burgin	Domeneaux
August H.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dondero
Andrews, Ala.	Camp	Doughton, N. C.
Andrews, N. Y.	Campbell	Drewry
Arends	Carlson	Durham
Auchincloss	Case, S. Dak.	Dworshak
Baldwin, Md.	Chapman	Eathman
Barden	Chelf	Eaton
Barrett, Wyo.	Chipperfield	Elliott
Bates, Mass.	Church	Ellis
Beckworth	Clark	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mo.	Clason	Elston
Blackney	Clevenger	Ervin
Bland	Clippinger	Fallon
Bolton	Cole, Kans.	Fellows
Bonner	Cole, N. Y.	Fernandez
Boren	Colmer	Folger
Boykin	Cooley	Fuller
Brehm	Cooper	Gamble
Brooks	Courtney	Gary

Gathings	Kilburn	Robison, Ky.	Roe, N. Y.	Sheridan	Tolan
Gavin	Kilday	Rockwell	Rogers, N. Y.	Smith, Maine	Torrens
Gearhart	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.	Rooney	Snyder	Traynor
Gerlach	Landis	Roe, Md.	Rowan	Somers, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gibson	Lanham	Rogers, Fla.	Ryder	Spence	Walter
Gifford	Lea	Rogers, Mass.	Sabath	Starkey	Wasielewski
Gillespie	LeCompte	Russell	Sadowski	Sullivan	White
Gillette	LeFevre	Sascer	Savage	Thom	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillie	Lyle	Schwabe, Mo.	Sheppard	Thomas, Tex.	Woodhouse
Goodwin	McConnell	Schwabe, Okla.			
Gore	McCowan	Scrivner			
Gossett	McGehee	Shafer			
Graham	McGregor	Sharp			
Grant, Ala.	McKenzie	Short			
Grant, Ind.	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes			
Gregory	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.			
Griffiths	Mahon	Simpson, Pa.			
Gross	Maloney	Slaughter			
Gwynn, N. Y.	Manasco	Smith, Ohio			
Gwynne, Iowa.	Mansfield, Tex.	Smith, Va.			
Hale	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.			
Hall	Martin, Mass.	Sparkman			
Leonard W.	Mason	Springer			
Halleck	Mathews	Stefan			
Hancock	May	Stevenson			
Hand	Morrow	Stewart			
Hare	Michener	Stigler			
Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Stockman			
Hartley	Mills	Sumner, Ill.			
Hays	Monroney	Sumners, Tex.			
Hébert	Mundt	Sundstrom			
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Taber			
Henry	Norblad	Talbot			
Herter	Norrell	Talle			
Heslton	O'Hara	Tarver			
Hess	Pace	Taylor			
Hill	Patman	Thomas, N. J.			
Hinshaw	Peterson, Fla.	Thomason			
Hobbs	Peterson, Ga.	Tibbott			
Hoeven	Phillips	Towe			
Holmes, Mass.	Pickett	Trimble			
Holmes, Wash.	Ploeser	Vinson			
Hope	Plumley	Vorys, Ohio			
Horan	Poage	Vursell			
Jarman	Price, Fla.	Wadsworth			
Jenkins	Priest	Weaver			
Jennings	Rains	Weichel			
Jensen	Ramey	West			
Johnson, Ind.	Rankin	Whitten			
Johnson	Reece, Tenn.	Whittington			
Luther A.	Reed, Ill.	Wickersham			
Johnson	Rees, Kans.	Wigglesworth			
Lyndon B.	Rich	Winstead			
Johnson, Okla.	Richards	Winter			
Jones	Riley	Wolcott			
Jonkman	Rivers	Wolfenden, Pa.			
Judd	Rizley	Wood			
Kean	Robertson,	Woodruff, Mich.			
Keefe	N. Dak.	Worley			
Kerr	Robertson, Va.	Zimmerman			

NAYS—155

Angell	Feighan	Lane
Bailey	Fenton	Larcade
Baldwin, N. Y.	Flannagan	Latham
Barrett, Pa.	Flood	Lemke
Barry	Fogarty	Lesinski
Bates, Ky.	Forand	Lewis
Beall	Gallagher	Link
Bell	Gardner	Luce
Bender	Geelan	Ludlow
Biemiller	Gordon	Lynch
Bishop	Gorski	McCormack
Bradley, Pa.	Granahan	McDonough
Buckley	Granger	McGlinchey
Bunker	Green	Madden
Butler	Hagen	Mansfield,
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall	Mont.
Canfield	Edwin Arthur	Marcantonio
Cannon, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Carnahan	Harris	Morgan
Case, N. J.	Hart	Morrison
Celler	Havener	Murdock
Chenoweth	Healy	Murphy
Clements	Hedrick	Murray, Wis.
Cochran	Heffernan	Neely
Coffee	Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman	O'Brien, Mich.
Combs	Hollifield	O'Konski
Corbett	Hook	O'Neal
D'Alessandro	Howell	O'Toole
Davis	Huber	Outland
Dawson	Hull	Patrick
De Lacy	Izac	Patterson
Delaney,	Jackson	Pfeifer
James J.	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin
Delaney,	Kearney	Pittenger
John J.	Kee	Powell
D'Ewart	Kefauver	Price, Ill.
Douglas, Calif.	Kelley, Pa.	Quinn, N. Y.
Douglas, Ill.	Kelly, Ill.	Rabaut
Doyle	Keogh	Rabin
Eberhart	Kirwan	Randolph
Elsaesser	Kopplemann	Rayfield
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Resa
Engle, Calif.	LaFollette	Robinson, Utah

Roe, N. Y.	Sheridan	Tolan
Rogers, N. Y.	Smith, Maine	Torrens
Rooney	Snyder	Traynor
Rowan	Somers, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Ryder	Spence	Walter
Sabath	Starkey	Wasielewski
Sadowski	Sullivan	White
Savage	Thom	Wolverton, N. J.
Sheppard	Thomas, Tex.	Woodhouse

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Knutson

NOT VOTING—16

Arnold	Curley	Norton
Bennet, N. Y.	Dingell	Reed, N. Y.
Bloom	Fisher	Welch
Bradley, Mich.	Fulton	Wilson
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Ill.	
Crosser	King	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Bennet of New York for, with Mr. Crosser against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. King with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL. I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to amend the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota moves to amend the title to read as follows:

"A bill to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not until 11:30 this morning that I had an opportunity to read the amended Case bill as printed in the RECORD. Up to that time, I intended to support the bill, as I have at various times announced from the floor. I intended to vote for it. But when I read these sections, I changed my mind.

Permit me very briefly to refer to the history of the Case bill and the methods by which it was forced through the House.

TWO WRONGS DO NOT MAKE A RIGHT

Blasted out of their complacency by an aroused public, a coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans, dominated by its more politically minded Members, hastily threw together strike legislation, gave it to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who, with the support of the Rules Committee, brought it to the House floor.

In writing the legislation, its sponsors acted without the aid of the Committee on Military Affairs or of the Committee on the Judiciary, both of which have been considering such legislation for several years, and they deliberately refused any recognition of or aid from the Republican members of the Committee on

Labor who had made possible the consideration of the bill.

Whether deliberately or inadvertently, but probably through oversight, the writers of the bill failed to include jurisdictional language which would justify the passage of the bill. That defect was remedied by an amendment offered from the floor.

The bill contained a provision purporting to give Federal courts jurisdiction to issue injunctions to prohibit coercion and violence, boycotts, and secondary strikes, in labor disputes. Again, whether because of haste or deliberately, the language was inadequate to accomplish the purpose. This because, while the bill as written gave the Federal courts jurisdiction to issue injunctions, and to that extent repealed that provision of the Norris-LaGuardia Act prohibiting the issuing of injunctions in labor disputes, it did not repeal five subsections of that act which prescribed the method and the degree of proof which must be submitted to the court before an injunction can be issued. Those subsections have made it extremely difficult, in many cases impossible, to obtain an injunction against violence or threatened violence in connection with strikes.

If those drafting the bill knew what they were doing and sincerely desired to give relief in labor disputes by way of injunction, or if they were familiar with Federal legislation, it would seem they would have included a provision making ineffective the "statutory restriction of injunctive relief" contained in section 52 of title 29, United States Code, which expressly states that:

No restraining order or injunction shall be granted by any court of the United States * * * in any case between an employer and employees—

Except when certain conditions, somewhat similar to those contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, are complied with.

Many of the Members of the House—and I was one of them—wanted a modification of the proposed injunction relief as written. Some, because they knew that as written it meant little, if anything; others, because injunctions will not give adequate relief against boycotts or secondary strikes in those cases where a large number of men are involved.

As an illustration: Today tug men in New York Harbor have called a strike which seriously affects the food and fuel supply of the city of New York. A court might, under the Case bill, issue an injunction forbidding the men to strike. We all know it would be ineffective because courts cannot compel men to work. The court might issue a mandatory injunction, naming each man and requiring him to go to work. If sustained—but I do not believe it would be—an individual might be put in jail for failure to obey the injunction, but that would not make him work, and, if he was compelled to work with a man standing guard over him, the chances are that his work would be of little value.

What, then, you ask, would I suggest? Time and again I tried to induce the sponsors of this bill to adopt the remedy of, for a short period—I repeat, for a short period—depriving unions and

members of unions of the special privileges granted them under the NLRA if and when they willfully violate the terms of a contract to which they have agreed, or deliberately use threats, coercion, intimidation, or violence in their efforts to impose their will upon others.

As long ago as 1939, I contended, as I do today, that the only adequate, long-time remedy was amendment of the basic labor law, the NLRA, the so-called Wagner law. A majority of the House now agree; but some of those who have been thinking along the lines of political expediency, who have received political support from the National Association of Manufacturers, from State associations of manufacturers, from the heads of farm organizations, from prominent members of the United States Chamber of Commerce, have refused to give consideration to the amendment of the National Labor Relations Act; though, when the present bill came to the floor, they assumed to speak at this late day as the sponsors of needed legislation.

They rejected proposed amendments designed to protect the public from strikes which deprive it of food, water, power, communications, transportation. Taking advantage of the situation, they refused to even consider other amendments offered by several Members of Congress and which the authors of those amendments sincerely thought would give better legislation.

They forced advocates of fair legislation to vote for or against this bill as written, thinking that those who were sincere in their desire for a remedy would vote for the present bill even though they knew it was not the answer to the people's demand. They forced this issue even though, according to the press, some of the leaders have prophesied that it would not be accepted by either the Senate or the President.

They forced the issue on this bill, even though it contains a provision that, for a violation of either section 11 or 13—and a simple assault and battery on the picket line would be a violation of section 11—an employee, a man who must work for his livelihood, shall be deprived of any and all benefits given him by the national labor relations law, and that penalty is imposed without limitation as to time. It is a life sentence denying to a worker the right to join a union, to bargain collectively through his representatives.

Let me quote the penalty contained in section 11, which is similar to the one in section 13:

Any individual who violates any of the provisions of this section shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act.

I had intended to vote for this bill notwithstanding its other defects, but after this morning reading the bill as amended, and that was the first time it was available; realizing the severity of the penalty, I voted against the passage of the bill, and for that action I have no apologies to make.

Consistently and vigorously I have opposed and sought relief from unjustifiable procedure by union organizers, union

officials, and union picket lines, but I never will vote to deprive a man forever of the benefits of a law enacted for his protection just because for a moment he lost his temper, slapped someone's face. Before our so-called labor troubles are appreciably lessened the Congress will by public sentiment be forced to amend the NLRA.

To aid in determining what should or should not be done to aid in diminishing labor disputes and preventing strikes, I have caused to be reprinted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1946, the National Labor Relations Act as written and proposed amendments in parallel columns. This will enable those desiring to make amendments to quickly understand what is proposed. No claim is made that these amendments are the answer. They are merely suggestions printed for the convenience of those who are seeking real relief from a lopsided law which, in the opinion of some, has tended to encourage labor disputes, increase the number of strikes. There is nothing new about this proposal. Unlike the present bill, it is not the conception of a small group, some politically minded, working under cover. It is my own proposal offered first in 1939, printed in the RECORD in 1940, and now again suggested.

Having for more than 10 years been an outspoken opponent of intimidation, of coercion, of violence, of unlawful practices followed by union organizers and union politicians, I regret more than anyone will know being forced into the position of apparently opposing legislation said to be designed to remedy the things which I have condemned.

My condemnation of the NRA, of the NLRB, of those labor unions and labor leaders who followed improper, unlawful procedure, does not, however, justify me in voting for a measure which would deprive the laboring man of one of his most cherished rights—the right to bargain collectively with his employer.

If and when the proponents of this legislation bring it back from the Senate, with amendments which will guarantee equal justice under law to all, it will receive my most enthusiastic support.

The penalty provision to which I referred is most unjust; it is unreasonable, and legalizing it just because something is demanded is no answer to our problem.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The gentleman recalls that I offered an amendment to correct that and it was voted down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and I offered an amendment which limited the penalty to be imposed upon the union to not more than 6 months.

Depriving a man for life of the benefits conferred in sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act just because he violated either section 11 or 13 of the Case bill is medicine which I cannot take.

The eighth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America reads as follows:

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

If the penalty carried in those two sections is not a "cruel and unusual punishment," then I can conceive of none. How the sponsors of this bill can, to the workmen of America, justify their support of that, their refusal to accept amendments, I cannot understand. Can you?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have not participated in the debate on the pending labor bill because of my necessary absence from the floor in presiding over hearings being held both mornings and afternoons on the pending agriculture appropriation bill. I am, however, deeply interested in the subject matter and have given study to the various bills which have been submitted for consideration and to the present bill in its form as amended in the Committee of the Whole.

In the Committee of the Whole, on yesterday, I supported the proposal to substitute for the pending bill, the bill introduced by the gentleman from California, Congressman VOORHIS. There was, of course, no record vote on that proposal. I therefore make my own position a matter of record in this manner since I feel that my constituency has the right to know my position on important subject matters of this type whether record votes are had in connection with them or not.

I feel that the objective of those who are dealing with this controversial issue should be to secure the enactment of legislation. No advantage will accrue to anybody nor to the general public through outbursts of feeling on the part of either those who undertake to voice the wishes of management on this floor or of those who undertake to speak for labor, nor from the attempt to enact legislation which will veer so far in one direction or the other that its very intemperance will destroy the chances of its enactment or of beneficial results therefrom even if it could be enacted. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in crucifying either labor or industry. I am interested in the enactment of some legislation which may tend to solve the difficulties which exist in labor-management relations at the present time. Such legislation, in order to have a chance of enactment, or a chance of successful administration after enactment must be temperate in character and must be fair in its ultimate objectives both to employers and employees.

I have tried to weigh pending legislative proposals in accordance with these views. After doing so I felt that, while none of the several bills which have been offered here have in my judgment been perfect in character, the Voorhis bill, which proposed in substance the application to industry generally of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, offered the best hope both of final enactment and of administration in such a way as to bring about relief in present labor-management difficulties. I therefore supported it on yesterday as a substitute

for the Case bill, but it was rejected by a vote of 101 to 183. There then remained pending before the House only the Case bill as it has been amended in the Committee of the Whole. I do not feel that it has the chance either of final enactment or of successful administration that would have been had by the Voorhis substitute, yet Members of the House were faced with the necessity of either supporting the Case bill or voting against the enactment of any legislation at all. I feel very earnestly the necessity for the enactment of legislation. I realize that the Case bill will be revised and reviewed in the Senate and that legislation must be finally worked out which will meet the approval of the President, otherwise it will be vetoed and nothing at all will be accomplished. I have therefore voted for the pending bill as it has been amended because to do so will be to help to expedite the final decision of this problem by the enactment of at least some legislation undertaking to deal in an effective way with the tremendous labor-management difficulties which now exist and which have so greatly impeded the efforts of our people to get our national economy upon a sound basis. That result cannot be obtained unless we are able to bring about peace in industry, and peace in industry will not be secured by legislation which swings too far either toward the side of labor or toward that of management. I reserve the right in voting for the pending bill to compare its provisions with whatever legislation may be worked out in the Senate or in conference committee and may hereafter come before the House as a substitute for the pending proposal, and I shall then vote in accordance with my best judgment and in line with the objectives which I have described and which I feel should be the goal of all of us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence passing between him and the President of the United States on the subject of the British loan.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, Mr. ROMULO, may at this point address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of Philippine independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I have inserted into the RECORD a series of editorials which have appeared in the American press during recent weeks commenting on the current problems of the Filipino people. These editorials reveal what all of us already know—that everywhere in the United States there is a deep and abiding friendship for the Filipino people.

These editorials have appeared in large newspapers and small, in metropolitan daily and country weekly, in the East and in the Middle West and in the Far West. These editorials truly voice the conscience of the American public. They

agree, with an impressive unanimity, that we in the Philippines deserve American help in our recovery program, and that we deserve this help right away. They recognize the unbreakable links that bind our two peoples together. They acknowledge the American responsibility to the Philippines in its hour of need. They are the voice of America, and it is a good voice, a friendly and intelligent voice, a helpful and sympathetic voice.

Some of the editorials indicate a very understandable lack of complete information. For example, I find in many a thread of doubt concerning the Filipino desire for independence. One newspaper reports that "many Filipinos look forward with increasing reluctance and apprehension to the prospect of independence 6 months from now." Another quotes "an American observer" as declaring that "80 percent of the Filipinos are leary of immediate independence and wish the United States would wait another 5 years before releasing the islands from its aegis." A third remarks that "already we hear the uneasy whisper that Philippine independence will be premature, that the Filipinos are not ready for it, and that our defense needs forbid it."

Let it be said, to the everlasting credit of American public opinion and the American press, that none of these newspapers recommends unilateral action by the United States to postpone or withhold independence. Not one proposes that the United States refuse to go through with the recognition of Philippine independence next July. What they do say, generally, is that if it is true that many Filipinos do not really want independence so soon, then the United States must indeed listen to their plea—that the initiative must come from the Philippines, however—and that the United States is ready to do whatever the Filipino people ask in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to clear this whole thing up, once and for all.

The simple truth is that we want our independence, and we want it on July 4, 1946, and we hope to see the topmost representatives of the American people as our honored guests at the ceremonies in Manila when we take our sovereign place among the family of free nations. That should be as proud a day for America as it is for the Philippines.

We want to go forward. For generations we have dreamed of the moment when our Nation would at last fulfill its destiny, when our 18,000,000 human beings could make their contribution to the welfare and the peace and the progress of the world. That dream is the dream of independence. Not one of us, in the past, ever thought that its fruition would come in the midst of Nation-wide devastation and misery. But that is how the hand of destiny has written our future, and we stand ready for the difficult times ahead of us. We of the Philippines want our independence. Let there be no mistake about this. To us this is a closed matter beyond argument.

Spiritually, Mr. Speaker, there can be no better time for Philippine independence. We shall cross the threshold in a time of dire distress, amid a multitude

of difficulties and hardships, with our souls wearied and our bodies wounded and scarred. But, as we enter the era of independence, we leave the era of enemy occupation. Independence will be hard for us, but occupation was harder. Freedom holds no terror for us. For we have tasted the bitter draught of oppression, and we have had our fill. None of the trials, none of the tribulations, none of the complications, that lie before us can possibly be worse than those we went through during the Japanese invasion of our homeland. If we had entered this new phase of our national life 5 years ago, let us say, we might perhaps have left with regret the soft, easy status of wards of America. Today we have passed the test of fire, and our spirit is strong. We face the future, with pride and with hope, without fear and without regret.

I do not deny that some Americans who have been in the Philippines recently have come home with a different impression. And I should like to explain why they labor, quite sincerely, under such a misconception.

Our people is a grateful people. We who have fought the bloody battles of the Philippines, who have felt the grim terror of war in our midst, who have seen our beloved homeland humiliated under the harsh, imperious hand of the invader, are everlastingly grateful to the sons of America who traveled thousands of miles over ocean and jungle to help liberate us. We feel, as a nation, the way the internees at Santo Tomas felt when rescue came—the way the prisoner of Dachau felt when liberation arrived.

Many of your friendly, wise-cracking, heroic GI's have made good friends in the Philippines. They have visited our homes and partaken of our fare. They have enjoyed our fiestas and dated our girls. And often, sitting in the little home of a simple Filipino family, or exchanging small talk with Filipino civilians during a break in their military duties, the American soldiers have struck up conversations on political matters.

A soldier might ask, as thousands seem to have done, "How do you like America?" And the Filipino answer has always come from the heart: "We love and respect America; we feel toward America and the Americans the way we feel toward no other people on earth; we are grateful to America for her help and for our liberation." And then the soldier might ask, as thousands seem to have done: "But what about your independence? Do you really want to cut yourselves away from America, if that is the way you feel about us?" It is hard for a Filipino whose heart brims with gratitude to give a flat and abrupt answer to such a question, framed in such a way. And so our people, who are bred in a tradition of deep courtesy, reply, "Naturally we do not want to divorce ourselves from America."

And so, out of an amalgam of gratitude and courtesy, has grown this widespread misunderstanding of our real desires. But, Mr. Speaker, I know that the sincerest courtesy requires that the truth be told. The truth is that we do want our independence. The truth is that all our people, with few exceptions, want our

country to fulfill its sovereign destiny. The truth is that, in the midst of the presidential election campaign which is now going on in the Philippines, both candidates have come out flatly in support of independence next July and against any idea of turning back, of re-examining, of postponing. If any Filipino politician were to raise his voice against independence today, the voters of the Philippines would rise up and defeat him. Politically, he would be committing suicide.

It is true, of course, that our people look upon independence in a somewhat different light than they did 10 years ago, or even 5 years ago, and possibly this change has misled some American observers into misunderstanding our attitude.

Before the war, we had too frequently come to look upon independence as the millennium for the Philippines. For millions of our people, national independence seemed to be the gate to a golden age of untold wealth and unbounded happiness. Too often there was a tendency to minimize the new and difficult responsibilities of independence, and to concentrate on the outward signs that the Filipino people had at last come of age.

Today few of our people live in such a dream world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Under the laws which we have passed, as I understand it, if nothing else is done the Philippines will become independent on the 4th of next July. Is that correct?

Mr. ROMULO. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. So there is nothing we can do to expedite the matter?

Mr. ROMULO. No, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. And unless there is some interference, the Philippine Islands will become independent on July 4, 1946?

Mr. ROMULO. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. The first resolution I ever introduced in Congress was for complete independence of the Philippine Islands, and I still stand on that proposition. I am delighted that your people are about to have their lofty ambition gratified.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman be able to tell the House what percentage of your people really desire their independence at this time or on July 4, 1946.

Mr. ROMULO. The exact percentage is difficult to say.

Mr. DONDERO. Would you say it is a vast majority of them?

Mr. ROMULO. An overwhelmingly vast majority.

Mr. DONDERO. You would be different from the American people if you did not want your freedom.

Mr. ROMULO. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman who is addressing the House, Mr. Speaker, is one of the heroes of Bataan. He saw American and Filipino soldiers fight side by side and saw their blood mingled together. It was not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, that it was the privilege of some of us to go to the Philippine Islands to help inaugurate the Philippine Commonwealth Government, at which time the late Secretary of War Dern, representing the President of the United States, told hundreds of thousands of Filipino people that Uncle Sam always keeps his promise; the Filipino people will have their independence on the 4th of July 1946. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this House and the committees of the House, who have charge of certain legislation, will bring that legislation to the floor of the House in order to make that independence just a little easier for people who suffered so much for freedom.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank you, sir.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When you receive your independence on July 4, 1946, you feel that the people of the Philippine Islands are well able to take care of themselves and look after the welfare of their people, in order that they may have the privileges that go to a country which wants to give its people freedom, liberty, and independence.

Mr. ROMULO. We are ready to suffer the trials and tribulations that freedom may bring with it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to say that I think the Filipino people have not only earned the right to independence, which I trust will not be delayed, but they also have earned the right to expect a helping hand from the United States in the immediate years which lie ahead of them following their independence.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Approximately 13 years ago in this month, it was my privilege to be chairman of the committee that reported the first bill for Philippine independence in this House. I was convinced at that time, the committee, some of the members of whom are still here, was convinced, and this Congress was convinced that the Filipino people had met the requirements set up by President McKinley when he pledged that this country would give to the Filipino people their independence as soon as this country felt they were qualified and prepared to establish and maintain a civil government. As I said, the committee was convinced from the testimony submitted, the Congress was convinced from the testimony submitted, that the Filipino people had qualified; and it was a great privilege and pleasure and a great honor for me to participate in that legislation.

I am glad to learn that the time is drawing nigh when this people will be

given an opportunity to demonstrate their fitness, demonstrate their ability, and demonstrate their qualifications to maintain and sustain a great democratic system of government, which has been their ideal, as I understand.

Mr. ROMULO. We are indeed grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, less than 1 week ago I was in Manila and I saw the terrible destruction wrought in that great city. Ten days ago I was on Corregidor looking across that small stretch of water to Bataan where the gentleman in the well of the House and the brave men of the Philippines helped hold back the Japs so long with so little.

I was terribly disappointed when I saw Corregidor. I had pictured it in my mind as an American Gibraltar. What did I see there? Guns of the vintage of 1903 and 1905, 12-inch mortars, 14-inch rifle guns—worse than inadequate. For the life of me I cannot understand how MacArthur's and Wainwright's men and General Romulo's brave Filipinos stood those trials so long.

Yes; I am for Philippine independence and I am for the prompt enactment of those bills now before the committees of the House to bring justice to ruined Manila and our Philippine comrades who stayed with us in our blackest hours.

They were with us when we needed them most. It is only fair that we give our best to them when they need our help. Justice is justice. Let us give it to them, cheerfully, unhesitatingly, and now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If it had not been for the court martial and the humiliation of Gen. Billy Mitchell the Philippines would never have been taken by the Japs; and there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say further that whenever our military leaders on the rock at Corregidor wanted to bring in some modern guns and equipment the Japs protested that we were violating the Treaty of 1922.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In my opinion, the act granting the Philippines independence is one of the most important acts ever passed by the Congress. In the first place, we kept our promise of over 40 years ago that when your country was able to handle its own affairs it should have its freedom.

In the next place, and far more important, is that by granting to the Philippines their independence we have set an example and laid a pattern for other countries to follow, that may be of the greatest importance in bringing peace to the world. Other countries or areas, similar to the Philippines, that are a natural geographic, racial, or economic units may likewise desire their independence and the right to govern themselves. Our example may be a model for other countries to follow in handling colonial areas who may wish to and when able to

handle self government should have it. Imagine what this may mean to the stability of the world. It may ultimately result in the liberation of vast areas and millions of people who, like ourselves, yearn for freedom and the right of self government. The success with which the Philippines handle their freedom may convince other countries having colonial possessions that true progress may be made by granting liberation and autonomy to populations and areas that may be able to handle their liberty and govern themselves.

I should like to add one personal note here, and that is that my youngest brother, a mining engineer, and his wife and baby, who at the time they fled was only 2 months and 15 days old, successfully eluded the Japanese. They were in Japanese-occupied territory—for 39 months. Through the kindness of the Filipinos in not telling where they were or giving word to the Japanese who occupied the area they were able finally to be liberated, came out of the Philippines, went to Leyte, and were taken back to America.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As a Member of this House, it is a source of gratification and pride that free and liberal America is seeking to give independence to one of its colonies. It will be an example for the empires all over the world.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

All around us we see the dread mark of war on the face of our islands. We see our ruined cities, our broken economy, our crippled agriculture. We rise from the ashes of victory, beset by fearful wounds and an uncertain future. It is in such an atmosphere that we face the future. Our head is still high. But we are not too proud to realize that we need help. We do not ask for soul-stifling charity, for ease and indolence at the expense of your toil. But we need your help now, so that we may help ourselves.

I do not need to inform the Members that the American High Commissioner to the Philippines, the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, has just returned to Washington from Manila. He has carried with him an urgent appeal for American assistance in the Philippine rehabilitation program. In the statement he issued when he arrived here, Commissioner McNutt said:

I seek quick action on the essential legislation which must be passed before the Philippines can get rehabilitation under way. . . . Eighteen million Filipinos have their eyes on Washington today to see if the promises we made to them during the war are going to be kept.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first-hand conclusion of an American statesman who has seen with his own eyes the conditions in the Philippines today. He knows how much the Filipino people must depend on America to assist them in rebuilding that which they lost in fighting for America.

When war broke out in December 1941 the Filipino people did not exact any promises from the United States before

they would fight. They did not ask for guaranties or pledges. Of their own free will they took up arms to fight the Japanese. And after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, they did not wait for promises before they formed their resistance groups. They fought, asking for nothing, because they had faith in America. And because they had faith in America, they had faith in the pledges which President Roosevelt and other American leaders voluntarily made to them during that long period of enemy occupation. I am inserting in the RECORD today a brief résumé of the many promises which were made to the Philippines while the war was going on, and after it was won—promises which the Filipinos believed with their whole hearts, promises which all the other peoples in the Orient believed as well. And now, not only 18,000,000 Filipinos but the whole Orient have their eyes on Washington to see if those promises are going to be kept.

I quote further from Mr. McNutt's public statements:

Independence for the Philippines is a settled fact, but we must take the necessary steps to make that independence a success or we shall lose all the credit we have been building up in the Orient and the world by granting independence to the people of the Philippines.

He appealed for passage of both the Bell trade-relations bill and the Tydings rehabilitation bill, and then he went on to say:

We are pledged, by act of Congress, by the written words of the President of the United States, and by our national conscience, to bind the wounds inflicted on the Philippine Islands through our war with Japan.

We are pledged to grant the islands their independence on July 4. That pledge will be kept.

But we are also pledged to prepare the islands for independence and to insure the establishment there of a free and democratic republic, which also means a prosperous and going nation. Toward that pledge we have shown a strange indifference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we talk about the discovery of the Philippines, and there is the general impression in this country that the Filipinos were savages, which is a mistake. The Filipinos had a high state of civilization at the time of Magellan's adventure, and in the battle against Magellan and his aggressive followers they killed Magellan with steel weapons, which shows they were not living in the stone age, as some people think, but were civilized along with the other nations of that portion of the world.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman. I thank all my distinguished colleagues who spoke today. Your expressions of good will and friendship I am sure my people appreciate deeply. May I not ask that you now go further and transmute your statements into action and help me get something tangible from this Congress for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, in this hour of our national rebirth in the Philippines, we ask for the redemption of the American

pledges to which Commissioner McNutt has called attention. We need your help. We count on the legislation now pending before the Congress of the United States—the Bell trade relations bill and the Tydings rehabilitation bill.

For the Filipino people know that economic rebirth must go hand in hand with political rebirth. If we are uncertain, it is because we do not yet know where we stand economically. If we are hesitant, it is because the will of the American people has not yet been fulfilled. If we are uneasy, it is because the lack of a definite policy toward our country makes it well-nigh impossible for us to lay our plans.

But for us there is no turning back. The choice is not that. It is whether we shall embark upon our independence with the spirit of self-confidence and economic strength arising from your help—or whether we shall start falteringly, uneasily, unsure of ourselves, because we do not have your help. That choice is not ours to make. It is up to you.

I have no doubt where the American people stand on this matter. They have made their position clear too long for any of us to misunderstand it. They have spoken through the pledges of their President, their Congress, their press, their every word of friendship. All that is needed now is the final action which will redeem these pledges.

In the name of my 18,000,000 countrymen, I plead with you to take that final action quickly.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the Case bill, H. R. 5262, entitled "Labor Disputes Act, 1946," because I hope it may help to solve some of the present labor-management difficulties the country is experiencing. There can be little question that a large portion of the rank and file of wage earners desire some kind of legislation that will make it possible for them to continue uninterruptedly in their employment. The public at large is strongly demanding action by Congress on this matter.

However, there are some features about this measure which I feel may, in the long run, not work out so well in the interest of the Nation. I refer particularly to the Mediation Board. If such a Board could be always unbiasedly operated, free from political influence, it could become a great good. What one must fear nowadays is that there is danger that such influence would be exercised over the Board's activities. I have in mind the recent experience where the President requested the books of the General Motors Corp. be turned over to him for inspection.

I want it understood that in voting for this measure I consider myself in no way bound in the future to support legislation providing for a Mediation Board.

And furthermore, it is very doubtful if the Case bill (H. R. 5262) will go very far in solving the many labor problems confronting our country because the legislation does not go to the root of the trouble. A simple law guaranteeing the right of every person to work wherever he pleases, at whatever compensation he can voluntarily agree upon with the employer without having to pay tribute to anyone would solve most of the employer-employee wage difficulties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement made before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on February 5.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times of February 7, entitled "Magic of Formula 'That Never Varies'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I expect to make in the Committee on the Whole this afternoon and include therein a table which I have prepared with reference to the numbers and costs of employees included in the President's budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio address he recently delivered in Springfield, Mass.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a copy of a letter addressed to Secretary of State Byrnes regarding the present trouble with American foreign policy.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Architectural Forum, and in the other quotations from Race and Democratic Society.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a petition signed by my constituents, and I also ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in debate this afternoon on the civil functions appropriations bill and include therein certain statements and figures from the hearings on that bill.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include excerpts from letters and newspaper articles.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include the opinion of the United States Court of Claims in the case of Robert Morss Lovett et al., against the United States. I

am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the Record and will cost \$221, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

H. R. 4908

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, responding to the request of the President I have been on the floor in support of H. R. 4908 to provide for the appointment of a fact-finding board to investigate labor disputes. I regret that the parliamentary situation has not given me an opportunity to vote for H. R. 4908. I could not support the Case bill, a bill that will take away so many of the hard-won rights of organized labor.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I ask unanimous consent that Report No. 1312, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, Union Calendar 397, be withdrawn.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore ordered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, unlike the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], sponsor of the labor bill we have just passed, and his supporters, who in debate this week successfully opposed amendments to broaden the scope of his labor bill, and asserted that overall legislation should be considered when the present state of unrest has passed, I have felt right along that unless we did a complete job now we would not have that opportunity later when public interest has subsided.

I felt right along efforts to amend on the floor would be futile. For this reason I voted against the rule bringing up this bill for consideration. This bill, though drastic as against labor, is too limited. Labor unions need some drastic curbs,

yes, but so does management, which is equally at fault.

Despite the fact that efforts to broaden it have failed, I have voted for this bill today in the hope that in conference between the House and Senate, the bill will be broadened and that machinery such as that contained in the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill now pending in the Senate will be provided.

Public utilities and other corporations affected with a public interest, are subject to regulation by Government. There is nothing un-American or undemocratic in this, nor in legislation which would require both labor and management in such enterprises to submit to arbitration by Government when collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration have failed. In no other way can the public be protected, unless it is by seizure of the plants, which is socialistic and in my concept undemocratic. There is no other alternative.

The bill now pending in the Senate, prepared by experts in labor relations, and studied for months, does make such provisions and others equally necessary. I realize, of course, that when both labor and management join hands in opposition to any bill so providing the interests of the public have but little chance, and the possibilities of enacting effective legislation will decrease when the public interest has waned. The present bill, in my opinion, takes it out on labor for its sins, while permitting management to continue serenely on its way, despite the fact that management has shown even less concern for the public in this crisis. I have voted for the bill, however, in the hope it will be broadened in conference. Workers as distinguished from the union leaders would welcome Government arbitration, for they suffer more by their present "trial by combat" methods.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, hundreds upon hundreds of wives of servicemen in my home town of Tacoma, Wash., have banded together in an organization known as the Service Fathers' Release Association.

At a recent meeting of that organization I was presented with some startling material and confronted with complaints of a disturbing character. Among other things discussed was a letter written by a Navy man, who is the 22-year-old father of a 3½-year-old son. This letter was directed to Mrs. Robert J. Moffett, who is chairman of the Tacoma branch of the Service Fathers' Release Association. Because the disclosure of this man's name and exact rank might result in discriminatory penalties being imposed upon him I am omitting his name. The letter is self-explanatory and is as follows:

DEAR MRS. MOFFETT: I'm not only writing this letter for myself but for many unhappy and lonesome fathers on Okinawa and

throughout the Pacific. From day to day we wait for news of our return to the States and our loved ones. We remember and cherish all the happy hours which we spent with our wives and with our children, when they play in the yard and holler with joy and delight of happiness. We can't forget their tender little kisses when we returned home after a hard day's work.

Most people in the States have the idea that these islands are a beautiful paradise. They are completely wrong and should be told the truth. This isn't living; this is torture.

Now that the war has ended, our paradise can be nothing but home. We lie awake at night hoping and thinking of a happy future. We're eating our hearts out for the very things we're entitled to have, our homes, our families, and the good old U. S. A.

I hope our feelings have been somewhat expressed. We pray that your campaign becomes Nation-wide. Please accept this letter of appreciation for your sincere efforts in our behalf. We thank you very much and are happy to know us fathers are being thought of.

From the foregoing, it would appear how deeply moved are these fathers at their continued retention in the far-flung areas of the Pacific, and how they yearn for home and loved ones. The low morale of these men is pitiful.

Here is another letter from a service father in the Army. This boy is located on Okinawa. It is to be noted that this letter was written on last Christmas Day. The letter reveals how strongly many of the GI's feel and their hostility to commissioned officers generally. These boys feel that they are being discriminated against, that there are plenty of ships available, that GI's are being retained deliberately where they are not required.

OKINAWA, December 25, 1945.

There is plenty of dirty work going on over here by some officers who are afraid they will lose their commissions.

There was a cablegram from Manila to Okinawa intercepted by some of the enlisted men a few days ago, which stated, "There are 12 ships available for troops of the Okinawa area." The answer from Okinawa was, "We don't need them." So you see there is somebody who doesn't want to get these men off the island.

Furthermore, we have a pretty good reason to believe, the U. S. S. *Exiria*, which is supposed to be in a state of repair, delaying our trip home, is no worse off now than it was when it left the States.

I am personally of the opinion that more ships could be assigned to bringing back the GI's from overseas, that there has been constant bungling, that the delay in returning men after announcements had been made that they would be brought home at an earlier date was a terrible shock, that too many men are being retained in the service in order to justify brass hats holding their present commissioned ranks.

I call upon my colleagues to enact legislation which will force the War and Navy Departments to bring these men back right away.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include some of the commitments made to the Filipino people by American leaders.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include some of the editorials appearing in the American press on independence and rehabilitation of the Philippines. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the *RECORD* and will cost \$234, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances and include in one an article and in the other a newspaper item.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial on the splendid and untiring service of the Honorable Fred M. Vinson.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include excerpts from a radio program in which he and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] participated.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker I was unavoidably detained and was unable to be present on the roll call on the Case bill. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial on the subject of the British loan.

THE BREAD SUPPLY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a telegram at the end of my speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, everybody refers to the farmer as the backbone of the Nation. But when it comes to giving the backbone any strength, then we forget him.

All one has to do to realize what a neglected person the American farmer has become is to read over some of the letters I receive from the farm folks in my district. They say the farmer is going on strike. If he does, nobody will blame him.

The next crisis our dairymen and poultry raisers of the Northeast will face is a

feed shortage. According to one complaint that came to my attention, one of the largest cattle-feed distributors in the county is without any grain whatsoever.

In the words of this week's issue of the *Poultryman*, a weekly farm newspaper, "The Northeast is being the first area to feel the pinch of feedstuffs."

In the meantime, the steady shipments of wheat, corn, and other grains continue to foreign countries at a terrific rate.

Just how will the American people feel when suddenly they awake to the fact that the Nation's supply of beef, milk, poultry, and other products from livestock is disappearing because the farmer cannot get feed.

Now that the meat strike has been settled, it will be difficult to blame meat shortage on packinghouse workers.

No, it is time to raise the question, how much grain can we allow to leave the United States and still enjoy the products of the farm. The American people certainly have a priority on our own food supply. It is not right to give other nations the meat, eggs, and dairy products that go for the basic American diet.

I am not trying to alarm you when I say I am deeply concerned over the growing shortage of dairy and poultry feed here in the Northeast. I am therefore introducing a bill in Congress entitled "A bill to prohibit the export of grain from the United States for a certain period":

Be it enacted, etc., That no grain shall be exported from the United States until it is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture that sufficient quantities of said grain have been distributed to areas of the United States now suffering from shortages of livestock and poultry feeds.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., February 6, 1946.
Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand that shipment of wheat and flour abroad and demands for animal feed in the domestic market threaten the white bread supply in this country. The importance of bread as an inexpensive food should be recognized. American people want plentiful supplies of white bread, not brown bread. The baker has suffered from shortages of all kinds during the war and shortages are worse at this time than at any time during the war. A white-flour shortage would be about the last straw for the average baker. We hope the bakers may have your support on this most vital problem.

Mr. SPAULDING,
President, Spaulding Bakery, Inc.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the *RECORD* and include therein a telegram dealing with the present wheat situation of the Nation.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the *RECORD* and include therein a recent article by Stanley High of *Reader's Digest*.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include a state-

ment by Mr. H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the said statement is estimated to make three and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of \$173.40. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5400), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] as to the time to be allotted for general debate?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think not to exceed an hour and a half would be adequate. We are rather anxious to finish the bill today if we can because of the national holiday next week.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate close at 2:45 o'clock this afternoon, and that we finish the bill, the time for general debate to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5400, with Mr. STIGLER in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations for the civil functions administered by the War Department has discharged its duty and is now ready to submit its findings and conclusions to the House for further determination.

Hearings on this bill before the subcommittee were quite extensive and in

view of the heavy duties imposed upon each individual member by other activities, and especially the heavy work in their own offices, I wish to express my appreciation to every member of the committee for the cooperation demonstrated in our efforts to bring before you a bill that we feel is entitled to full support. There are items in the bill that do not have the full endorsement of each Member, but the measure presented here represents the cooperative and combined judgment of the entire membership of the committee.

The bill now before us is to provide funds for the following activities: Cemetery expenses, Alaska communications system, river and harbor and flood control under the Corps of Engineers, United States Soldiers' Home, and the Panama Canal.

The total amount recommended for these various activities of Government for fiscal year 1947 is \$300,987,498. This is an increase over the amount appropriated for the same activities for the present fiscal year of \$39,895,958, but the committee, in its careful study of the facts before it, found it possible to recommend a reduction of \$36,041,011 from the Budget estimates. In only one item has the committee recommended an increase, that being in the item for rations for members of the United States Soldiers' Home, which I will discuss later and in order.

CEMETERY EXPENSES

The amount of \$2,433,000 proposed for cemetery expenses is an increase of \$685,300 over the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year. Included in the increase is \$71,340 for 5,316 more headstones than were provided for during the present fiscal year. There is an increase for construction work of \$105,280, consisting principally of roads and drainage systems which should not be further deferred. Maintenance and repair of cemeteries is increased by \$383,786, comprising \$118,628 for additional labor and \$265,158 for contractual work and supplies. The remainder of the total increase, which is \$124,894, is for operating expenses, and consists of \$31,725 for personal services, \$90,639 for equipment, and \$2,530 for miscellaneous expenses.

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

The present bill recommends an appropriation of \$543,000 for fiscal year 1947 and assumes that signal service of the Army funds will not be made available to cover obligations of the system, as has been the case during the war period. For example, in fiscal year 1945, obligations for the system covered by Alaska communications system funds were \$227,840, whereas similar signal service of the Army obligations totaled \$2,775,146.

The system provides the framework for all civilian and military communications in Alaska and has been operated by the Signal Corps since 1901. The nucleus of personnel trained in the system prior to World War II made it possible to provide efficient engineering, installation, operation, and maintenance of the greatly expanded communications

system required by the Army in Alaska and western Canada between 1941 and 1946.

The recommendation is based on a plan to operate 33 stations in the system—32 in Alaska and a master station at Seattle, Wash. During the war period a total of 46 stations were operated. Twenty-one stations were in operation when the war started.

One hundred and fifty civilian and 300 military personnel will be used to maintain and operate the system. This will reflect a reduction from 350 civilian and 2,000 military personnel during fiscal year 1945. Just prior to the war, 52 civilians and 191 military personnel were used to operate the system.

Receipts from commercial traffic are estimated at approximately \$700,000 during fiscal year 1947. The value of Government traffic, if charges were made at commercial traffic rates, is estimated at approximately \$2,000,000. Use of radiotelephone facilities will result in increased commercial traffic. Revenue from commercial traffic in fiscal year 1941 exceeded \$450,000, and for the preceding several years had increased at a rate of about 10 percent per year.

Increased military activity in Alaska creates most of the growth of Government traffic over prewar levels. The value of Government traffic, estimated at commercial rates, in fiscal year 1941 was \$1,162,000. The fiscal year 1945 Government traffic at commercial rates was valued at approximately \$8,800,000.

Submarine cable is installed from Seattle, Wash., to Attu, Alaska, by way of Whittier, Alaska, but it is not planned to use this cable west of Kodiak. Present plans contemplate use of the cable between Seattle and Kodiak as long as major rehabilitation is not required.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Following the cessation of hostilities, Congress considered supplemental estimates to permit the resumption of Federal public works construction which had been suspended during the war. The First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, appropriated approximately \$25,000,000 for resuming the program for rivers and harbors; \$85,000,000 for flood control; and \$15,000,000 for flood control on the Mississippi River and tributaries. Those amounts have permitted a start on the return to peacetime construction operations on such programs. The amounts here recommended will provide for a continuation of projects for which funds were appropriated in the deficiency act and for continuation of other projects now under way with earlier appropriations.

The war quite properly and necessarily required the suspension of all river and harbor and flood-control works not directly needed for successful conclusion of hostilities, but that gap has also served to emphasize the urgency of returning to peacetime schedules as quickly as possible in accordance with plans carefully studied and authorized by Congress. Major floods have occurred during this interval in several of the larger river basins of the country resulting in tangible flood damages of over \$350,000,000

and heavy loss of life, disruption of essential community and industrial activities and other substantial losses of an intangible nature. If the gap in the flood-control construction program had not occurred, many of the projects previously started would have been completed and in operation and a substantial portion of those losses would have been avoided. Many other projects which are not yet started would have now been nearing completion.

Floods are unpredictable but certain to recur. Now that hostilities have been terminated, further delay to full return to peacetime progress on the civil-works program will result in a further extension of our wartime experiences with losses due to inadequate river channels and harbors and lack of flood protection. The dates upon which the various projects in the river and harbor and flood-control programs will be completed and placed in operation to provide the benefits to the commerce and security of the Nation, for which they have been authorized by Congress, depend entirely upon the rate at which appropriations are made available.

I am better acquainted with and have more first-hand knowledge of the facts concerning the upper Ohio River Valley than any of the other major river basins. The waters of the upper Ohio Valley are made up largely of waters from the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers and their tributaries, which furnish the water that causes the floods in Pittsburgh, and to a large extent, on down the river to its confluence with the Mississippi River. The great damage that has resulted in the Pittsburgh area had been much talked of for the past 42 years to my personal knowledge, but no constructive action was taken toward adopting a program until 1936. Prior to that time no funds were appropriated for the upper Ohio River Valley or for any flood-control projects in the western Pennsylvania area. The best available information discloses that prior to 1936 estimated direct damages to the Pittsburgh area totaled \$310,741,000. Since that time the estimated direct damages total \$131,674,000, making a total of \$441,415,000 damages to the Pittsburgh area.

Prior to 1936 nothing had been done throughout the Nation to prevent flood control, generally. Think of it, \$310,000,000 of damage by floods and nothing set up to curb it. In 1936, President Roosevelt recommended that Congress set up a flood-control program for the Nation. Congress did this by setting up a flood-control legislative committee headed by the capable gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON. So we started the flood-control projects throughout the Nation in 1936.

It was in 1936 that I had the honor and the pleasure of being made chairman of this committee. Thus all of the money appropriated for the entire Nation for flood control, generally, has come out of my committee. In other words, my committee initiated the appropriations for all the projects, general throughout the Nation, since that time, a sum total of \$628,921,000. My congressional district is in the upper Ohio River watershed. The Ohio River, as you know, is made up

at Pittsburgh by the confluence of the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers. These two rivers and their tributaries furnish all the water for Pittsburgh and all the water that floods the Pittsburgh area. We have built the following flood-control or multipurpose dams on the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers and their tributaries since 1936, namely:

Tygart River Dam, W. Va., February 1938.

Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa., October 1940.

Tionesta Reservoir, Pa., January 1941.

Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa., June 1941.

Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa., partial operation, June 1942.

Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa., partial operation, November 1942.

Plus \$9,000,000 for flood-control channel through the city of Johnstown, Pa.

Plus \$6,000,000 included in this bill and the last deficiency to start work on the Conemaugh River Dam, which will give additional protection for the Pittsburgh area.

I take pride in the fact that during my services in Congress and my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Flood Control was at the time when all this wonderful protective work for Pittsburgh and the Nation was being done. Since 1936 my committee has recommended and Congress has appropriated more than \$67,000,000 for flood-control protection and projects for the Pittsburgh area and more than \$628,991,000 for flood control, generally, throughout the United States, and more than \$514,000,000 for flood control on the Mississippi River.

Every flood-control project that we build is a Nation-building project. For national protection and national security for the future we should build four or five times as many flood-control projects next year as we have set forth to be built in this bill.

You know we will never catch up if we do not build more projects each year. As stated in the former paragraph, for instance, the damages in the upper Ohio in the last 10 years were \$131,000,000 and yet we only spent \$67,000,000 toward protecting or stopping these flood damages. We now know that if we had started 50 years ago to conserve our water by building dams and flood-control projects and plant trees at the right places, that we would have few of these dust storms throughout the Nation and practically no flood damage.

I recently took my committee on an inspection and observation trip of 36,000 miles around the world, stopping at some 40 Army posts and installations where we had equipment in order that we as a committee might get first-hand knowledge of our installations and property and thus be able to more intelligently appropriate for the future and suggest what should be done with surplus as the result of the war and stoppage of war activities. It was on this trip that we saw desert lands by the millions and millions of acres in China, India, Iran, Iraq, Africa, and Palestine area, caused over the centuries by the peoples of that time not taking care of the water channels, water facilities, and water storage. If we do

not do more as a Nation in the next hundred or two years, than we have done in the past, along the line of protecting our national resources through river, harbor, and flood-control improvements—we can expect nothing better at the end of a few centuries here in the United States than deserts like appear in these old countries.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

The amount of \$42,776,250 recommended in the instant bill will permit continuation of work started under the funds authorized in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, on 21 projects. The estimated amount required to complete all river and harbor projects authorized by Congress is approximately \$623,000,000. Of this amount \$569,000,000 is the estimated cost for completion of work not subject to foreseeable delays due to nonfulfillment of local cooperation requirements.

The amount recommended for maintenance of existing projects, operation and care of canals and other works of navigation, examinations, surveys, and contingencies, and other continuing and routine operations is \$67,871,500. This amount includes \$8,000,000 for the construction of a large seagoing hopper dredge primarily for use in New York Harbor. At the present time there are more than 1,000 completed or partly completed projects located throughout the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands requiring periodic maintenance. During the war period, due to scarcity of labor, materials, and plant, maintenance work was limited to that essential to the war effort, with the result that many projects have shoaled to such an extent that navigation is severely handicapped. Repairs to structures also have been postponed due to scarcity of materials and labor.

The water-borne commerce of the United States for the calendar year 1944 amounted to 605,928,000 tons, an increase of 25,347,000 tons over the previous calendar year. The railroads—classes I, II, and III—carried 3,156,480,000 revenue tons during the same period, or a little more than five times as much as the water-borne commerce.

Total authorization for general flood control, general, \$1,680,400,000.

Appropriation, general, \$628,921,000.

Mississippi, total authorization, \$864,934,000, of which \$200,000,000 is for navigation as well as flood control authorized in the act of 1944; \$514,000,000 for lower Mississippi River. There remains to be appropriated \$200,000,000 and about \$150,000,000 of the previous authorization for flood control of Mississippi.

FLOOD CONTROL

The amount of \$96,150,000 recommended in the present bill, while \$28,200,000 less than estimated by the Bureau of the Budget, provides for work on 62 projects, most of them having been started or continued with appropriations in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946. There is no program of the Federal Government looking to the future that gives promise to future generations as does the benefits of flood control which protects the lives of our people, the fer-

tility of the soil, and eliminates the destructive forces of waters on rampage. It is in truth building for the future.

Funds in the amount of \$3,000,000 are recommended to provide for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications to allow for the completion of advance planning for a considerable number of projects which will place those projects in a position for prompt initiation of construction when funds for that purpose are appropriated. There is always the thought in providing for works of this sort that it may be used to supply jobs in times of labor depression. Such is not the purpose of the recommendations contained in the instant bill for it is believed that each of the projects for which funds are recommended are economically justified aside from the factor of employment.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

The only general appropriation carried in this bill that has been recommended for an increase over the Budget estimate is that for the Soldiers' Home. The increased amount recommended is for the purpose of giving members of the home a better allowance for subsistence. During the present fiscal year ration costs per day per person were set at 46 cents. This has proved insufficient and the Budget by supplemental estimate has submitted an additional estimate to bring this amount up to about 52 cents per day. Since the Army in this section of the country, faced with much the same problem of securing subsistence supplies, allows 62 cents per day per person, it is the belief of the committee that an approximate amount should be provided for members of the Home and the recommended funds will provide near that amount.

Funds from which this appropriation is made are not funds collected through taxation of the general public but are provided by means of monthly deductions from the pay of enlisted men and warrant officers of the Regular Army, military fines, forfeits accruing from desertions, sale of unclaimed effects of dead soldiers, and interest accruing on sizable funds thus collected and held as a trust fund in the Treasury of the United States.

This home is a national shrine and should be classed in the same category as the Arlington National Cemetery. It was purchased with funds collected by Gen. Winfield Scott from Mexico at the close of the War with Mexico, and set apart as a haven for disabled Regular Army soldiers. Its membership is limited to those who have had 20 years in the military service of the United States, part of which was served in the Regular Army; to those who have had some service in the Regular Army and who have been rendered incapable of earning their own livelihood by reason of disability incurred in the military service of the United States; to every soldier, active or discharged, of the Army of the United States—which includes services in the Regular Army, Volunteer Army, National Army, United States Guards, or National Guard called or drafted into the Federal service—who was an enlisted man in said Army during any war, or who has had

any service where the armed forces of the United States have been employed and their lives hazarded in military operations, or who has contributed, except through fines and forfeitures, to the support of the United States Soldiers' Home, who has had some service as an enlisted man in the Regular Army, and who by reason of wounds, sickness, old age, or other disability, incurred after enlistment, or aggravated by military service, is unable to earn his own livelihood. In all cases the veteran must have had some service in the Regular Army.

The management of the home is vested in a governor, a deputy governor, and a secretary-treasurer, selected by the President of the United States. Other necessary officers are employed by the board of commissioners. A medical officer is detailed from the United States Army.

The home is one of the most attractive spots in the District of Columbia, containing approximately 500 acres. It has several miles of hard-surfaced roads and is open at all times to the public, and in many respects serves as a public park.

THE PANAMA CANAL

The Budget estimate of \$19,801,000 for the activities of the Panama Canal is recommended in the bill. This recommendation reflects an increase of \$11,692,200 over the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year, but the increases are largely due to resumption of activities which were curtailed or deferred on account of the war. The enactment of Public, 280, approved December 28, 1945, authorizing funds for undertaking a review and study of the means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal accounts for an increase of \$1,500,000 requested in the Budget.

The total capital investment of the United States in the Panama Canal as of July 1, 1944, amounted to \$701,532,682.49. During fiscal year 1945 receipts for direct deposit in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts amounted to \$8,930,555.06. The net operating expenses, including depreciation and payment by the State Department to the Republic of Panama, but not interest, and after deduction of revenue repaid to appropriations, amounted to \$13,905,470.81, leaving a net operating deficit of \$4,974,915.75. Congress appropriates from the Treasury for current expenses each year only enough to pay the excess of the expenses over those earnings that are repaid to the appropriations. Fiscal year 1943 was the first year since 1916 in which the revenues of the Panama Canal were not sufficient to cover the ordinary operating expenses. In 1945 the deficit was greater than in 1943, but somewhat less than in 1944. The deficit each year since 1943 is due to the loss in tolls revenue as a consequence of wartime conditions.

For purposes of administration and accounting the Canal organization may be considered in three groups: Transit divisions, business divisions, and special engineering division.

The funds required by the transit divisions for replacement of worn-out plant and equipment, with the exception of

floating plant, must be specifically appropriated by Congress from general funds of the Treasury since no funded replacement reserves for these purposes are maintained by the Panama Canal. As a matter of theoretical accounting, depreciation charges are set up in the general Canal accounts in respect to depreciable property of transit divisions, but the depreciation shown is not retained or funded, except that pertaining to floating plant. Instead, the receipts are turned into the general fund of the Treasury each year in the form of revenues, including tolls, and are not available for expenditure by the Panama Canal without appropriation.

The unfunded depreciation reserve balance for these transit divisions on June 30, 1945—exclusive of floating plant—amounted to \$28,046,339.64. Thus, for this part of the organization, the Panama Canal is dependent upon Congress to provide the funds not only for current operations, but also for the replacement of worn-out and obsolete plant and for expansion as it becomes necessary to meet the requirements of efficient operations.

The business divisions, such as the municipal, electrical, mechanical, and building divisions, are auxiliary divisions, set up for administrative and accounting reasons, to furnish services—including construction work—and supplies at reasonable prices to other parts of the organization, to other branches of the Government, to shipping, and to employees. No appropriation from the general funds of the Treasury is required ordinarily for the operating expenses of business divisions. Last year their expenses were \$48,167,022.01, including depreciation. The net earnings, over and above expenses, turned into the general fund of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1945 amounted to \$1,469,183.52, or 3.08 percent interest on a plant investment of \$47,704,953 as of July 1, 1944. Funded replacement reserves are maintained by business divisions from depreciation credits accumulated for the replacement of worn-out or obsolete equipment.

Funds required for capital expenditures; that is, expenditures on new projects, for any part of the Canal organization must be appropriated by Congress.

The Special Engineering Division was created to plan and supervise the project covered by the act approved August 11, 1939, providing for the construction of a third set of locks. Funds for construction of the project were included initially in the appropriation for the fiscal year 1941, and subsequently in 1942, 1943, and 1946. Effective in May 1942, the third locks construction program was modified by direction of the Secretary of War, and on account of this directive no appropriation for third locks was included in the estimates for 1944 and 1945. Public Law 352, approved June 26, 1944, making available the appropriations for 1945, provided for the repeal of \$30,257,572 of the appropriation for third locks and this amount was returned to the general fund of the Treasury as surplus funds. In 1946

there was appropriated \$810,600 and in the regular 1947 estimates there is included an appropriation in the amount of \$1,118,000 for continuation of the work under the modified program. There is included in this recommendation also an amount of \$1,500,000 to provide funds for a study and investigation of means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, authorized by Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Peak traffic through the Canal occurred in fiscal years 1929 and 1930. Traffic declined during depression years, but for the fiscal year ended June 1939 again reached approximately the peak level of 10 years earlier. The outbreak of hostilities in Europe produced a decline in traffic between Europe and the west coasts of North and South America, with later on a gradual decrease in some of the other trade routes. The entry of the United States into the war produced a very sharp decline in the commercial tolls-paying traffic with the decrease in United States intercoastal trade—normally the most important trade served by the Canal—and the discontinuance of traffic through the Canal which served the far eastern territories.

Commercial tolls-paying traffic increased from 1,797 transits in the fiscal year 1944 to 2,300 in 1945, and free transits of combat, supply, and troop vessels of the United States, and vessels for repairs, which do not pay tolls, increased from 3,333 to 6,566 during the same period. This volume of traffic required additional personnel, and the continuation of the regular operating personnel on an overtime basis, throughout that part of the organization engaged directly in the passage of ships through the Canal, which in addition to general increases in the cost of labor, materials, and equipment experienced in recent years have increased the costs of all operations incident to the transiting of vessels and other services.

The revenue from tolls for the first 6 months of this fiscal year to December 31, 1945, totaling \$6,488,652.64, is greater by \$3,330,180.64, or 105 percent, than for the first 6 months of last year, and is more than one-half of the rate of tolls receipts during the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

Combined transits increased from 4,316 in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1945 to 5,152 in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1946, an increase of 19 percent. Based on these total transits for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1945, transits for the fiscal year 1946 will be considerably more than during the fiscal year 1939 of approximately normal traffic, when total transits were 7,481.

Appropriations for the Panama Canal provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the Canal, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone, continuation of the modified third-locks construction program, and for the investigation of means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal. The total amount appropriated for 1946 was \$8,108,800, but a supplemental request has been submitted in the amount of \$1,425,000 to cover the net cost of the increases authorized for Federal

employees which, together with \$13,833,892 carried forward from prior-year appropriations, will make a total available for obligation in 1946 of \$23,367,692. The amount recommended in the instant bill for 1947 is \$19,801,000, which includes the \$1,500,000 for investigation of means for increasing the capacity and security of the Canal, and \$18,000 for employment of additional teachers in the schools. The amount of \$19,801,000 together with \$2,430,580 expected to be carried forward from prior-year appropriations, will make a total of \$22,231,580 available for obligation in the fiscal year 1947.

The gross obligations of the Panama Canal are financed through the authorized use of receipts from sales and services and appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury. With the exception of net profits from business operations, funds provided for the Canal are available until expended. In general, it is contemplated that the expenses of the business divisions, including proportionate charges from certain transit divisions to cover the administrative and accounting services rendered, will be financed by receipts from sales and services. This procedure provides a sound basis for making appropriated funds available solely for activities chargeable to the Federal Government.

During peacetimes the Canal is used to a great extent as a commercial waterway and for more than 25 years produced sufficient revenue to cover the ordinary operating expenses. During the war years there was a deficit as toll-paying vessels were largely off the seas, but its value to the war effort would have justified the total cost of construction had it never been used as a commercial waterway. It was able to meet every demand made upon it during the war period.

During the last 3 or 4 years we did not present anything for this, but the War Department unit representing this item assures us that there will be sufficient to take care of all the needs of cemeterial expenses with this appropriation.

I pass now to the Alaska Communications System.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves the matter of national cemeteries?

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be pleased to. Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman will recall that 2 years ago or so both Houses passed and the President signed a bill that would permit the construction of a cemetery in the Northwest, in my district.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. There is none now within 600, 800, or maybe a thousand miles. I am wondering when we may expect an appropriation so that the mandate of that legislation will be carried out and this burial place for veterans provided?

Mr. SNYDER. I recall what the gentleman is speaking about. I recall his interest in that cemetery for the Northwest. I forget just where it is to be located.

Mr. ANGELL. In the vicinity of Portland, Ore.

Mr. SNYDER. And I took occasion, I may say, in the gentleman's behalf at

the recent hearings to mention that, and they assured me they expected within the next year that one national cemetery would be built in each State, at least, and in some of the more populous States, like my own Pennsylvania, probably two or three, to take care of this situation. I hope the project the gentleman is interested in will be among the first to be taken care of.

Mr. ANGELL. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's interest and trust he will help us get sufficient appropriation to construct that cemetery.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be glad to do what it is my duty to do toward that end.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman mentioned flood control. May I ask what the position of the committee was on the Whittier Narrows project. I see it is not included. Was it passed over without prejudice?

Mr. SNYDER. It is passed over without prejudice and I can assure the gentleman it will not be dropped. It will be considered when other findings are made to the committee in order to enable the committee to give more consideration to it. It seems to be about a 50-50 proposition.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I see that the Baker Bay project that has been formally approved by the engineers was not included. Was that passed over without prejudice?

Mr. SNYDER. It was.

Mr. SAVAGE. Are the appropriations by the House restricted to the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget on such projects?

Mr. SNYDER. Not entirely.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There is an item in the bill of three and one-half million dollars for the Mississippi River from the Ohio to the Missouri River. Would that include continuation of the levee-building program from St. Louis to Cape Girardeau?

Mr. SNYDER. That is money to be applied to the continuation of what has already been constructed.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I see, yes, and any possible new projects in there that have been surveyed and approved by the War Department engineers?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. On both sides of the river?

Mr. SNYDER. On both sides of the river.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Has the gentleman given any thought to the question of the marked erosion that has taken place in certain areas, such as around the en-

trance to bays? I refer particularly to Cape Henlopen, at the mouth of Delaware Bay, where there is considerable erosion. The State has applied for help through the engineers in Philadelphia and has been turned down on it. It was seeking to have bulkheads erected to stop that erosion.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not recall the project to which the gentleman refers, but I do recall that the Army engineers are bound by certain physical contours and physical boundaries. They can give assistance only under certain conditions. Perhaps the project the gentleman refers to is such that under the present set-up they would not be allowed to give assistance. I shall be happy to look into the matter for the gentleman.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Does the gentleman believe the State would have to bear part of the cost?

Mr. SNYDER. I would imagine it would. As I see it, speaking for myself only, I think the State should, and especially now when all States of the Union have more money than they ever had before.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Yes, I know they have more than the Government has.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; they ought to be willing to step in.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I suggest to the gentleman from Delaware that probably this project has not been authorized, or, if it has been authorized, apparently the engineers have found that without the State aid it cannot be economically justified as a Federal project.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which held hearings on this bill, is coming before you with the most complete record and justifications that have been presented to the House in any bill which has been presented by any one of my subcommittees during the 10 years I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee. Anyone who is interested in rivers and harbors, flood control, or irrigation and reclamation should keep this record for future reference.

When the deficiency appropriation bill came up last fall it contained approximately 118 projects. There were 57 projects, as I recall it, that had been stopped by the war before they were completed. I was in favor at that time of continuing those projects. I opposed approximately 62 new projects which I felt should have further study by the committee because of increased costs. I took the position that they had no place in a deficiency bill. I realized, of course, that it was futile to try to oppose a bill even in part which had 118 flood control projects in 31 States which were represented in Congress by 371 Members.

The House voted overwhelmingly to pass the bill despite the fact that I still thought that there were some projects in that group that should not have been passed. I accepted the verdict of the House as final. The House has spoken and I shall not oppose in any way any

of the projects upon which the House acted at that time.

This bill contains, as pointed out by the chairman, appropriations to continue these 62 projects and also provides for some additional projects. The Appropriations Committee and this subcommittee holding hearings on that part of the bill last fall for the Deficiency Committee were criticized because the record was incomplete. No such criticism can be made toward this bill as this record is most complete.

During the hearings before the Deficiency Committee last fall, Major General Robins testified in answer to my question that there was a 6-year program on flood control. It was the first time that anyone had spoken of a 6-year program on anything. After the bill had passed I took the matter up with the War Department and obtained this 6-year program. The evidence shows that the program was formulated at the request of the President and the Budget Bureau. A similar 6-year program was also asked for by the President on rivers and harbors and on irrigation and reclamation. Each of these programs will be found in the hearings. The 6-year flood-control program will be found on pages 275 to 297, inclusive. You will find there:

First. The name and location of each project.

Second. The year Congress authorized such project.

Third. The total estimated cost.

Fourth. The obligations to June 30, 1945.

Fifth. The estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1946 as they were estimated at the date the report was made.

Sixth. The balance required to complete each project.

Seventh. The estimated obligations on expenditures during the fiscal years 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Eighth. The balance required to complete such project after the fiscal year 1952.

The chairman of the Flood Control Committee testified before our War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that the total amount of work authorized which remained to be appropriated for was \$1,500,000,000. He, of course, did not have all the projects that are contained in this record. The testimony before our committee shows that there has been a 25 to 30 percent increase in construction cost since the war. It further shows that some projects will cost as much as four and one-half times the amount estimated by the Corps of Engineers when the project was presented to the Flood Control Committee for authorization.

For instance, the cost of Hoards Creek project in Texas was estimated by the Corps of Engineers at \$468,000. It will cost approximately \$2,200,000—see pages 347 and 348 of the hearings.

The Osceola Reservoir in Missouri was estimated at \$28,500,000.

Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of Engineers—see page 309 of the hearings—testified that the cost of the land now is estimated at \$18,158,000. Re-

cation of railroads, highways, roads, and utilities will cost \$19,982,000, and that the total prewar cost of the dam is now estimated at \$52,850,000. When we add 25 percent increase in cost which has occurred since the war, this project, the cost of which was estimated at \$28,500,000, will now cost \$65,000,000.

The Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota will cost over \$200,000,000 instead of \$131,000,000.

The Florida barge canal will cost nearly \$73,000,000 instead of \$44,000,000.

This 6-year flood-control program has in it 700 projects not including the Sacramento River and the Mississippi River work. The total estimated cost of these projects was \$3,781,038,800. When we add 25 percent increased cost on the uncompleted portion, we find that the total program will cost us \$4,492,790,300 when complete. Some \$900,000,000 worth of work has already been done, however, so the uncompleted portion of the 6-year program aggregates \$2,846,434,100. This again is the pre-war cost.

Without taking into consideration increased estimates, increased costs over and above the 25 percent as pointed out heretofore and adding only 25 percent increased cost, this means a program ahead of us of \$3,558,042,600. The 6-year program provides that this entire sum will be spent during the 6 years with the exception of approximately \$700,000,000.

SIX-YEAR RIVERS AND HARBORS PROGRAM

The President also requested and the War Department also submitted to us a 6-year rivers and harbors program. This 6-year program can be found on pages 148 to 165, inclusive, of the hearings. You will find there some detailed information which is found in the 6-year program on flood control. The total 6-year program was estimated at \$569,000,000. When we add 25 percent increased cost since the war began, we find that program has increased to \$711,225,000. You will find a similar increased cost on rivers and harbors projects that you found in flood-control projects.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

On pages 856 and 857 of the record you will find a 6-year program of the Interior Department on reclamation and irrigation. It also contains some detailed information that the other projects contain. The total project aggregates \$2,417,149,332. There will have been allocated, including the program for 1946, \$781,139,044, leaving a balance to be appropriated for, of \$1,636,010,288. The Interior Department representative appeared before our subcommittee on another project and very kindly furnished me with this information which is found in the record and which has enabled the committee to present the complete program to you.

TOTAL 6-YEAR PROGRAM

Summarizing we find that the total amount of the program before us on rivers and harbors, flood control, and irrigation and reclamation aggregates \$7,621,164,632. The record further shows that \$5,905,277,888 of this amount will be spent after the fiscal year 1946. This means almost \$1,000,000,000 a year for this purpose. These figures, adding the

25-percent increase in cost since the war, do not include the increased cost by reason of change in plans, errors made in plans, and so forth, such as Osceola Reservoir, Hoards Creek project, Florida barge canal, Garrison Reservoir, and other similar projects.

No one seems to know what the exact cost of that program is going to be. No good business firm would proceed with such a program in the face of increased costs and in the face of the financial condition of the Nation. This is all the more true when we take into consideration the fact that every project is justified on the basis of the ratio of benefits to costs. For instance the Hoards Creek project was justified on a ratio of benefit to cost of 1.32 to 1—see page 348 of the record. Lieutenant General Wheeler insisted that it could still be justified on the basis of benefit to cost despite the fact that the cost had increased 400 percent.

I feel strongly that the entire rivers and harbors and flood-control program should be resubmitted to the proper legislative committees, each project gone over, the actual cost determined and after determining the actual cost then decide upon the facts whether or not the ratio of benefit to cost justifies the construction of the project. The Interior Department's figures incidentally were, I was told, up-to-date, 1945 costs. It is for this reason that I did not include them in my recommendation.

The Osceola project, a flood-control project in Missouri, was estimated to cost \$28,500,000. General Wheeler, Chief Engineer, testified before our committee that it would cost \$18,000,000 for land alone; some \$19,000,000 for location of highways, airports, railroads, telephone, and electric lines. The cost for the relocation of those items and the land alone was \$38,000,000. The total cost would run up to \$52,000,000. When you add 25 percent you have a cost of \$65,000,000 on a project the cost of which was estimated at \$28,500,000.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. And that dam is located at such a spot that it would create a lake in the upper reaches at least 10 miles wide, and would cross at least four railways—the Missouri Pacific, the Frisco, the Kansas City Southern, and the Missouri-Kansas-Texas railroads. I am not going to say any more, but I wish the gentleman would yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The project is not in the bill. We cut it out.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the gentleman and other members of his subcommittee for striking that out.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Was the gentleman from Michigan able to obtain from the Army, and did he obtain, all the data they were willing and able to furnish in an attempt to prove it was economically justified?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes; but they have not yet satisfied me that it is economically justified.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. And, therefore, as far as the gentleman is concerned, and the committee is concerned, it is dead.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. As far as I am concerned, it is dead.

We had another project, a small project down in Texas, estimated at \$468,000, yet the actual cost is going to be \$2,200,000, or four times the amount estimated.

When these projects come before a legislative committee they are passed upon on the basis of ratio of benefits to costs. In this last project the ratio of benefit to cost was 1.32 to 1. Despite the fact that the cost of that project was increased over four times, the Chief Engineer thought it was still justified, when the ratio of benefit to cost was 1 to 1.32.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Are the estimates in this bill figured on the new costs or are they on the basis of the old costs?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The estimates you have before you in this bill are based upon prewar costs. I tried to get the accurate figures from the Chief of Engineers to find out what the actual cost would be, but they were not given to the committee when they came here on the items.

Mr. PLOESER. It seems to me most unfortunate that the Congress should have to appropriate on inaccurate bases in relation to these large expenditures.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I finish? Let us take the rivers and harbors part of this program. The rivers and harbors program is a 6-year program that was asked for by the President. The items aggregate on a prewar cost basis \$569,000,000 plus 25 percent, or another \$142,000,000, and, mind you, these figures I am giving you, Mr. Chairman, include no increase except the 25 percent. They do not include, for instance, the Osceola project which went up four times, rather than going up 25 percent—or twenty-five and eight million. This makes the program stand at \$711,000,000.

The Interior Department has a program of \$2,417,000,000 for reclamation and irrigation, and remaining to be appropriated \$1,600,000,000. These three agencies have a total program of \$7,621,000,000 for irrigation, reclamation, flood control, rivers and harbors; and there remains to be appropriated to meet these obligations \$5,906,000,000, or almost \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Has the public ever been told that by the administration?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The public has never had these figures before. It took a great deal of work on my part to get them. They were submitted to me, however, by the different agencies. There is no question but what we were being fed these items on the old basis. And, remember, that in these projects Osceola, which would cost \$65,000,000 is in there at \$28,000,000 plus 25 percent, or about \$35,000,000. Garrison Dam, in North Carolina, is in there at an esti-

mated cost of \$131,000,000, but the actual cost will go to \$200,000,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is the Florida ship canal in here, too?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The Florida ship canal is in the bill. I expect to discuss that when I make a motion to strike it out.

Here we have a total program of \$7,600,000,000 of these items. Nobody knows what the cost is going to be. The Interior Department had actual 1945 costs. Time and time again we asked them but they could not give us itemized costs, and we are proceeding to appropriate items some of which cost four times the amount authorized by the committee.

I have always been one of those who believed that the integrity and the power and the authority of the legislative committees to authorize appropriations ought to be protected. It is for this reason that on my motion we placed into the report a statement that hereafter we would not consider any project—where the cost exceeded the estimate by 25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. What the gentleman has just said is astounding. To think that the administration would be planning a \$7,000,000,000 program of public works and not taking the public into its confidence. Is that what I understand the gentleman to say?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. All I can tell the gentleman is that the first I knew of it was when General Robins admitted to me in the Deficiency Subcommittee that he had a 6-year program. I then demanded a break-down on this 6-year program and I got the figures on it.

General Stratton of the Army Engineers Board told me it was submitted by the engineers at the request of the President. The Army engineers made the same statement regarding the President asking for the 6-year program when the bill came up on rivers and harbors.

Mr. PLOESER. I trust the gentleman's information. No one in the Government doubts his ability to seek into these things and bring forth the truth.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. These are not my figures I am giving you. They are Army engineers' and reclamation figures.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to congratulate the gentleman because of his initiative and ability as a member of this committee, but in order to keep the record straight, may I say that most of these investigations were authorized by the legislative committee. Investigations over the years have been had and re-

ports made and authorizations passed by the Congress. The fact is we do these things in piecemeal fashion and eventually we have a program that is entirely too large.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. You will find in the record the year that each project was authorized by the Congress or the authority for it. The thing just grew like Topsy.

Mr. NORRELL. I am interested in the provision in our report with reference to the excess cost of the projects and I wish the gentleman would state for the record what he understands the procedure to be with reference to these projects where the costs are in excess of 25 percent more than the original authorization?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. First, the provision in the report, and if I am wrong the gentleman can correct me, was not intended to apply to any project in this bill or heretofore commenced. Second, hereafter, where the cost on any of these projects exceeds the amount of the authorization or the estimate of the engineers by 25 percent, it should go back to the committee.

Mr. NORRELL. I think at that point it would become the duty of the Army engineers, where costs for any reason exceed 25 percent of the original authorization, to refer those projects back to the legislative committee for further action.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It is the sense of the committee, as I understand it, where the costs exceed the authorization and the estimates by 25 percent for any reason the Army engineers should go back to the legislative committee and get proper authorization.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Is that the position of the committee?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is in the committee report.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BENDER. Has the gentleman any figures to indicate how much the comparative cost of transporting, say, a barrel of oil through the proposed barge canal would be with, say, the railroad charge?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will take that up when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to say in connection with what the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has said that it is one thing for the Congress to authorize an investigation of a project, and it is quite another thing for either the Congress or the administration to actually plan that project. As I understand it, this committee's information reveals that the administration is going ahead planning a program involving six or seven billion dollars' worth of public works, yet this is the first time the public has been let in on it.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I clarify the situation? I want to be fair

in the matter. The gentleman from Arkansas and I have worked on this project. The entire committee has worked on it, as a matter of fact. When the President asked the Army engineers to go back and make this 6-year program investigation, they went back and got the authorized projects which were authorized by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

They went back and got the projects as authorized by the Congress and put them into the 6-year program, and it will amount to nearly a billion dollars a year.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to compliment the gentleman. That is a very fair statement, and exactly what the situation is.

Mr. PLOESER. I want the gentleman to know that I did not infer that I disagreed with what the gentleman from Arkansas said. The thing that astounds me is that this is so late in getting to public attention.

Mr. NORRELL. The point I am making is that it has had consideration all along, but we ought to stop the authorization of projects in this Congress.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The thing I want to emphasize is this: No business concern would handle its affairs in that manner, and it is not good business for Congress to go ahead and build a project, the cost of which was estimated at \$28,500,000, which is going to cost \$65,000,000, or three times as much. You would not do it in your own business, and we should not do it in our business here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it that we are starting a lot of projects now when labor is so scarce practically all over the country, when there are more jobs now than we have men to put in industry in order to get industry started?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Let me answer the gentleman right now. The reason you are starting this project is because the House voted my motion down by an overwhelming majority to cut these things out last fall, and I could not even get a roll call on my motion.

Mr. RICH. Then the only way we can stop it is to get another vote on the gentleman's motion.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The way to stop it is to stop authorizing, and when the amount exceeds the estimate, quit appropriating for it.

Mr. RICH. Another thing. Why is it that when we get estimates for so many of these projects we always find that the construction costs three to four times the amount of the estimate, as a rule, as submitted to the committee?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Because of several reasons. In the first place, we have had from 25 to 30 percent increase in all costs since 1939. In the second place, many times they have changed the plans and specifications whereby they have added some power or flood-control project, and many times the estimates

are made upon a superficial basis by the Corps of Engineers, which estimates were not complete when we got them.

Mr. RICH. That is not always the reason. They told us that the Pentagon Building would cost \$30,000,000 but they spent over \$100,000,000 on it. That is the way with a lot of their items.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my brief remarks by saying that I am for adequate flood control. I am for this flood-control item in this appropriation, even though it does not contain a much-needed project in my Third West Virginia District.

I am, Mr. Chairman, dead set against this item in the War Department civil-functions appropriations bill now pending in the manner in which it was handled. It is chock-full of favoritism and discrimination. It has far too much Budget Office directives to suit me and a lot of other Members of this House.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, it forces the Congress to wonder whether the Congress or the Budget Office is determining our flood-control policy.

We are told there is only \$110,000,000 available for flood control in 1947. We were also told there were to be no new projects in the 1947 program now before this Congress. There appears to be plenty of money when we want to make a foreign loan or vote relief to people other than our own.

Some of the items now before us for consideration have every indication of favoritism. One such item is the much cussed and discussed Buggs Island power project in North Carolina. This item first made its appearance in the deficiency appropriation for 1946. The initial appropriation was for \$1,000,000. Now we find this same project gets \$3,000,000 more out of the paltry \$110,000,000 the Budget Office tells the Congress they can spend for this purpose.

I, too, was before the subcommittee on appropriations when the deficiency bill was being considered and asked to have inserted a project known as the Sutton flood-control dam on Elk River. I was told not to press the matter in the deficiency budget; that my item would be included in the regular 1947 appropriation. It is not so included. I represent a district that is among the first 50 in Federal tax-paying ability. It has eight approved flood-control projects authorized by Congress. Not one single cent of Federal money has been appropriated for this district. The Sutton has top priority over any other project in West Virginia. The plans and specifications are ready to advertise for bids. I protest the action of the Budget Office in leaving out a worth-while project like this that has no facilities for producing power in favor of increased and additional appropriations for the Buggs Island proposal.

I shall, at the proper time, attempt to insert in this appropriation bill all those items which the Budget Office has so arbitrarily seen fit to delete from the program of worth-while recommended

projects submitted to the Budget Office by the War Department engineers.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, at the present time the United States Government owes, directly, \$280,000,000.00. It owes directly and indirectly, including war-risk insurance, altogether, nearly \$680,000,000.00.

If America is going to avoid the throes of inflation we must balance our budget.

The most dangerous feature of the President's budget which was submitted here on the 21st of January is the demand on the part of the various bureaus and departments for increased help.

Almost every single one of them carries a request for more personnel.

With a total in the civil agencies alone for the fiscal year 1946 of 925,077, the President proposes for these same agencies—and this excludes the Army and Navy—for the fiscal year 1947 a total of 1,042,059, an increase of 116,982; and these figures are in man-years, which means an increase of at least 125,000 new jobs costing an additional \$232,000,000.

It is true that we must have more help in the Veterans' Administration, but when the administration proposes such increases as 4,239 man-years in the Agricultural Department, 7,632 in the Commerce Department, 10,896 in

the Interior Department, 11,638 in the Post Office Department with declining business, 1,574 in the State Department, and 7,500 in the civil functions of the War Department, it is a perfectly ridiculous set-up.

I am inserting in the Record a table showing just what these increases are, and how bad they are. I hope that the Congress will cut out a large portion of this \$232,000,000 increase so we may begin to move toward a solvent Government and a balanced Federal budget for a change.

Nineteen forty-seven is the crucial year. Let us have a sense of responsibility here in the Congress and refuse to be a party to such increases.

Comparison of agency personnel requirements 1946-47 as shown in the 1947 Budget)

Departments and agencies	Man-years		Net man-years		Net money differences	
	1946	1947	Increase	Decrease	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President	52	225	173		\$561,350	
Executive Mansion and grounds	60	70	10		12,060	
Bureau of the Budget	738.7	875.5	136.8		529,500	
American Battle Monuments Commission	45.5	74	28.5		69,565	
American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments	7.9			7.9		\$24,809
Civil Service Commission	5,015.7	4,232.5		783.2		2,823,060
Federal Communications Commission	1,413.5	1,580.1	166.6		1,006,340	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	975.2	1,089.7	114.5		405,801	
Federal Power Commission	702.9	908.4	205.5		616,257	
Federal Trade Commission	479	605	126		410,701	
General Accounting Office	14,997.1	14,944		53.1	472,902	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,181.2	2,439.1	257.9		621,598	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,711.3	4,876.9		834.4		2,578,933
National Archives	331	380.8	49.8		138,503	
National Capital Housing Authority	230.1	234	3.9			8,156
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	5	7	2			5,869
National Labor Relations Board	160.9	1,001.2	140.3		458,379	
National Mediation Board	97.6	106.6	9		36,751	
War Mobilization and Reconversion	837.3	898.4	61.1		124,835	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,162	1,305.2	143.2		540,142	
Smithsonian Institution and National Art Gallery	682.5	822.1	140		134,324	
Tariff Commission	284	290	6		6,889	
Tax Court of the United States	123.3	126	2.7		3,811	
U. S. Employment Compensation Commission	519.3	502		17.3		38,393
U. S. Maritime Commission	8,077	5,344		2,733		9,338,376
Veterans' Administration	77,439.4	144,895	67,455.6		152,727,527	
Columbia Institution for the Deaf	87	90	3		2,800	
Food and Drug Administration	980.3	1,128.3	148		559,863	
Freedmen's Hospital	345.2	388.4	43.2		90,324	
Howard University	484.1	509	24.9		58,841	
Office of Education	346.8	348.1	1.3		173,720	
Public Health Service	19,008	20,369.1	1,361.1		7,635,842	
Social Security Board	11,588.5	11,907.8	319.3		862,792	
Federal Works Agency	17,824.8	17,877	52.2			1,423,427
Department of Agriculture	66,618.1	70,857.2	4,239.1		2,519,033	
Department of Commerce	25,994.4	33,627.1	7,632.7		24,580,601	
Department of the Interior	42,302.6	53,199.5	10,896.9		24,185,290	
Department of Justice	25,548.2	23,072.6		2,475.6		5,758,093
Department of Labor	5,320.8	4,587.1		733.7		145,504
Post Office Department	406,981.3	418,619.5	11,638.2		1,787,741	
Department of State	13,199.2	14,773.6	1,574.4		1,210,413	
Treasury Department	89,844.3	98,502.8	8,658.5		19,256,176	
War Department, civil functions	55,711.8	63,224	7,512.2		9,742,296	
District of Columbia	19,913	21,145.8	1,232.8		2,838,252	
Total	925,077.8	1,042,059.8	124,620.2	7,638.2	254,993,746	22,138,721

RECAPITULATION

Net increase in man-years	124,620.2	Net increase in personnel costs	\$254,993,746
Net decrease in man-years	7,638.2	Net decrease in personnel costs	22,138,721
Total net increase in man-years	116,982.0	Total net increase in personnel costs	232,855,025

NOTE.—This data does not include any departments or agencies for which estimates are to be submitted later, including the War and Navy Departments and other agencies.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Is the Committee on Appropriations going to lead the way in this reform the gentleman has so earnestly and, in my opinion, so pertinently suggested?

Mr. TABER. If the Committee on Appropriations does not lead the way and nobody else leads the way, I am going to lead the way. I do not propose to let the Congress adopt these in-

creases without giving it a chance to vote on them.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I know the gentleman will have plenty of followers if he leads the way.

Mr. TABER. I am hopeful that will happen.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the distinguished chairman and members of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations for their

careful and painstaking attention to the items contained in this bill and particularly the items for continuation of construction work in New York Harbor, the greatest seaport in the world.

You have recommended an expenditure of \$1,510,000 for deepening the Ambrose and Anchorage Channels from 40 to 45 feet and of \$3,634,000 for continuation of dredging and rock removal in part of the harbor. Also included is an appropriation of \$8,000,000 for construction of a large seagoing hopper

dredge, primarily for use in New York Harbor.

In the amount for flood control our committee recommended \$4,740,000 for construction work on projects in up-State New York at Syracuse, Elmira, Almond Reservoir, East Sidney Reservoir, and Mount Morris Reservoir.

I trust we shall have the full support of this Committee of the Whole on these meritorious and much needed appropriations which are recommended by my committee.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on War Department civil functions appropriations, we looked into every item as best we could. These items were carefully scrutinized and it is our belief that as we reported them, they are within reason. This is particularly true as the justifications relate to flood control, which I personally regard as necessary now inasmuch as this is really the first appropriations bill for flood control since the start of the war. It is most important that we start projects for flood control with as little delay as possible. There is a flood in some part of our country each year, the control of which is essential to our general welfare and progress.

At this point I wish to compliment Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief, Corps of Engineers, for the manner in which he expressed himself before our committee. General Wheeler was straightforward in his answers to questions and cooperated in every way possible in helping us to arrive at estimates for rivers and harbors and flood-control appropriations.

As to the estimates for the United States Soldiers' Home, I believe the functions at this institution entitle the administrators of it to all which we have recommended in our report. When we take into consideration the activities at the Home, such as the library, amusements, band, religious services, and so forth, I am convinced that great comfort and happiness is being provided for those who have served their country so well. The sanitary conditions and the health of its members have been satisfactory throughout the year.

In general, I regard the rest of the items in our report as essential now and the estimates entirely within what is just and equitable. We have been fair in arriving at what was requested of us.

While I am an advocate of retrenchment in our expenditures with the exception of what is absolutely necessary, such as the items to which I have already referred, yet we cannot escape the fact that our spending is getting out of hand. There is no good reason, in my judgment, why, with the proper exercise of economy and the determination on the part of Members of Congress, they cannot for the time being abandon certain pet projects which are not absolutely necessary to be carried on at this time.

People are not only expecting, but are demanding, that the appropriations be reduced and that they be relieved of some

of the excessive taxes imposed on them during the war. We should be opposed to new activities now, unless they are absolutely necessary.

Our expenditures are increasing at a rate entirely disproportionate to the benefits received or to the increase in population. We are building up more Federal instrumentalities, more commissions, and a more expensive system of administration. I cannot see where this is a government of law. It would be more appropriate to say that it is a government of commissions, by commissions, and in the interest of commissions. This is the period of administrative law. Statute law is no longer the rule of action. Bureaus, commissions, and executive agencies have committed to them not only executive powers, but also legislative powers. They make ordinances, regulations, and rules which have the force of statute law.

During wartime we expect and we know that we have a tendency to government by commissions and boards. War suspends and destroys local self-government and transfers to one or a few hands an authority theretofore exercised by the people. In peacetime many commissions, bureaus, and boards should be abolished and the powers which they have had delegated to them returned to the local communities, counties, and States.

The struggle is on between the consolidated and powerful Federal Government dominated by bureaucratic forces on one side and the rights of the people as individuals, the local communities, and the States on the other side.

The propaganda carried on by the executive agencies and Federal officials is demoralizing the people and breaking down their morale and leading them to the acceptance of the Federal Government as the source of power and authority which should superimpose itself upon the States, control their activities, and direct the lives of the people themselves.

If an appeal for an appropriation is denied, within a short time the constituents of a Congressman or Senator who has been instrumental in securing the rejection is appealed to and in turn pressure is brought on him to reverse his position.

What we need now is more democracy, not less democracy; more freedom and less centralization of power.

Will we continue to fashion a government along imperialistic lines and surrender the precious gifts of freedom?

This vital question the American people are interested in having the answer to now.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to compliment the committee on the work they have done here. The job of making appropriations for the civil functions of the War Department is not an easy one. There are many demands and there are many problems that arise. The need for public improvements on our streams has grown a great deal because that work has been held in abeyance

throughout the period of the war, just as the need for housing is now acute, because no houses have been built in the last 4 or 5 years.

As one member of the committee, which must recommend taxes to the Congress to be levied upon the American people, I say I, too, feel we should balance our budget and I am willing to vote for those taxes that will balance the budget. I am of the opinion that this bill is a good bill, a bill that is needed and one which we can support. I believe that sound flood control and irrigation projects are in the public interest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say as one member of the subcommittee handling these appropriations for flood control, I particularly appreciate the remarks that the gentleman from Nebraska has made, because having served on the legislative committee for flood control he knows something of the study that is necessary to determine what is a feasible or an unfeasible project. That, coupled with the gentleman's present service on the Committee on Ways and Means, particularly qualifies him to speak along the lines that he now is addressing the Committee.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will yield, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the subcommittee which has worked so diligently on this appropriation bill. Their problems have been most difficult in view of the many demands for projects, and at the same time an urge for a reduction in Federal expenditures. Then, too, I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Nebraska who is speaking, and who served for several years on the Flood Control Committee of the House. This committee spent much time in studying the projects on the various watersheds of the Nation and have submitted to Congress a comprehensive flood-control program that I am instructed will go far toward the elimination of floods.

It was my privilege to serve on the Flood Control Committee for two terms and therefore I am familiar with many problems that are presented to the committee on flood control under its able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Now that the war is over, we should be in a position to begin construction of some of these projects. The projects in this bill have the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. This means they have been checked and double-checked for economic justification. Both of these agencies working together should safeguard the interests of the taxpayer.

It is my contention that we must have source control of water run-off in the Nation and the comprehensive program that was submitted to Congress in 1938

is justified from every angle. Personally, I am most pleased that this appropriation bill includes an item for the completion of the Kanopolis Reservoir on the Smoky Hill River, which is a tributary of the Kansas River, and also an amount of money for the commencement of construction of the Harlan Reservoir on the Republican River. These are worthy projects and will have a decided effect on the flood waters of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. In this bill is also included an item for further study of the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam on the Blue River. I want to urge that the Army engineers continue their studies on this stream in order that this river valley may be saved if at all possible. It contains some of the most fertile land in the Kansas River Basin and every plan should be studied before the beginning of construction of this dam.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to say a word about the Army engineers. If we could observe the marvelous job of construction that the Army engineers have done in this war, in order to bring this war to its successful conclusion, we would have adequate reason to believe that their peacetime program is very much worth while. It has developed a corps of builders who can do the job in time of national emergency.

This bill carries funds for construction on the Harlan County Dam on the Republican River. On many previous occasions I have spoken of the need for flood control and irrigation on the Republican River and I wish to thank the committee for its inclusion in this bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Truman has sent a budget message to the Congress requesting a Budget expenditure of \$36,000,000,000. Remember this is a peacetime Budget. The largest peacetime Budget in our history. The last peacetime Budget of the New Deal was for the year 1941, of \$9,000,000,000. That administration was not noted in any way for its economy. So Mr. Truman wants four times as much. In the name of all that is good, it is up to the Appropriations Committee to get out the ax and cut out the function of Government and force the President to use his power under the recent law which the Congress passed to streamline the Government, or we will go bust. Yes, go broke.

President Truman says he wants \$25,000,000,000 a year during the balance of his term. With this estimate we will bust. The only way to save it is for the Congress to act, to vote economy; you now talk it, let us vote it. Where will you get the money?

In this civil-functions appropriation bill, the appropriation for 1946 was \$261,091,540. The Budget estimate for 1947 was \$337,028,509. The committee cut that down to \$300,987,498. But now I think it is up to Congress to do some more cutting. Let us get out the ax and cut this appropriation to the limit. Let us streamline this bill, if possible, so that we can really and truly say that the Congress is going to serve the people, and furnish only such functions of govern-

ment as are absolutely necessary to get along. For this reason you have a debt now of \$279,000,000,000, according to the Treasury statement, the greatest debt that was ever placed upon any nation in the history of the world. We are in a serious position. So it will require each and every Member of Congress to eliminate anything that can possibly be eliminated from these appropriation bills, if we are going to survive.

The item of interest alone is a great item, over \$5,000,000,000. The only way you can cut down that interest item is by cutting down the national debt. The sooner we do it, and the sooner we try to economize, the better for our taxpayers and our Nation.

Another thing, the President yesterday said it is going to be necessary for us to sacrifice in order to feed the starving nations of the world. We can do many things different than we are doing to aid in this worthy and humanitarian objective.

Let me make a suggestion to the President on how we might serve those people. I am in sympathy with trying to give them food to eat. Look at these food sales lists that come over our desks every day from Surplus Property, showing food owned by the Army and the Navy. Let us try to get those foodstuffs to the foreign countries through the Red Cross. That has been the greatest organization ever known to take care of starving people in foreign countries. It can do the work cheaper as well.

If you will look at some of the things contained in those lists: Here is dried milk, solid, over 77,000 cases. Let them give that to the foreign countries to try to sustain themselves.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Where are they disposing of that milk? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RICH. They are selling it to anybody who will pay the highest price in open bids.

Mr. PITTENGER. You know, do you not, that the President wants to feed our people brown bread. Has anybody told him that we have all this surplus milk and these other surplus products?

Mr. RICH. Certainly they should, and that is what I am calling attention to. We are going to have an opportunity to vote on \$1,200,000,000 more for UNRRA, so the President says. That is not the way to feed those starving people. That is not the best way nor the economical way to do the job.

Here is another item: 700,000 cases of canned asparagus. Here are thousands of cases of canned tomatoes. Here are thousands of cases of dehydrated tomato juice cocktails. Here are other thousands of cases of tomato juice cocktails. Here are 418,905 cases of spinach. Let us see that they get this stuff over into those foreign countries and preserve the lives of those people.

We have dried eggs for sale in great quantities. The Government has tons and tons of powdered milk for sale. Dried fruits of many kinds that can be used for the starving. Rations that were put up for our Army—good life-sustain-

ing food that will tide over the foreign countries. I say stop selling them for less than cost. Send them to starving countries and peoples. Stop selling things at a loss and then getting the UNRRA to pay the high price for more foods at a loss. That is the way you have been doing business for 12 years—now stop it and do it at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has worked hard on this measure and has given fair consideration to each project presented to it. I believe, however, that there may be some important levee construction delayed unless additional funds are made available for flood control on the Mississippi River in the sections between St. Louis and Cape Girardeau.

I am concerned because I know the need for more adequate levee protection for many southern Illinois counties. I do not want to see any interruption in the present plans of the War Department engineers for rebuilding old levees and constructing new levees that will protect thousands of acres of valuable farm lands and many miles of railroad roadbeds.

Each year the flood menace in the river counties in my own district is becoming more serious. Great areas of farm lands are annually thrown out of production by the raging water of the Mississippi. Large railroad terminals, freight yards vital to our Nation's welfare are constantly threatened by floodwaters.

It is Congress' duty to hold tight reins on the Nation's purse strings but it is false economy to withhold funds from levee construction which should be started at the earliest possible time.

I hope that in its final form this bill will carry sufficient funds to permit the War Department engineers to proceed with its program of levees for the protection of many thousands of acres of valuable land in the lower end of St. Clair County and the rich farm lands in Monroe County.

I am pleased that the bill provides funds for the start of construction of the Chain of Rocks Canal in Madison County. This is an important project that in future years will more than return in benefits it will bring the community the cost of construction. I am also pleased that funds have previously been made available in last year's deficiency appropriation for the construction of the Wood River levee in Madison County, Ill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cemeterial expenses: For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including fuel for and pay of superintendents and the superintendent at Mexico City, and other employees; purchase of grave sites; purchase of tools and materials; purchase (not to exceed five), repair, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying motor vehicles; care and

maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate graves, and including the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single approach road to any national cemetery constructed under special act of Congress; for headstones or markers for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines under the acts approved March 3, 1873; February 3, 1879; February 26, 1929; and April 18, 1940 (24 U. S. C. 279-280b), and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell; care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Mound in Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago, the Confederate Stockade Cemetery at Johnstons Island, the Confederate burial plats owned by the United States in Confederate Cemetery at North Alton, the Confederate Cemetery, Camp Chase, at Columbus, the Confederate Cemetery at Point Lookout, and the Confederate Cemetery at Rock Island; and for care and maintenance of graves used by the Army for burials in commercial cemeteries, \$2,433,000: *Provided*, That no railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way which may have been acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach upon any roads or walks constructed thereon and maintained by the United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for repairing any roadway not owned by the United States within the corporate limits of any city, town, or village.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANGELL: Page 3, line 10, after the figures "\$2,433,000" insert the following: "And the additional sum of \$605,240 to establish and maintain a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress."

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, on December 29, 1941, Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress was signed. This law provides for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The facts are that there is no national cemetery nearer than a thousand or fifteen hundred miles from Portland, absolutely no place where a veteran may be buried in a national cemetery. The nearest place is south of San Francisco or out in Montana.

This bill received the careful consideration of both Houses of the Congress and the President, and was signed, as I said, in 1941; but no appropriation has been made to provide burial facilities as authorized by this law.

Many of you may say that there is now pending legislation not yet approved to provide cemeteries in each of the States of the Union. That is true, but in no single instance, as far as I am advised, has the Congress itself authorized the construction of a cemetery that has not been constructed except this one. The Congress did authorize the construction of this cemetery by reason of the urgency of the case. Every veteran in this whole territory has been up in arms by reason of the fact that there is no place for a veteran to be buried in a national cemetery in this whole Northwest territory.

My amendment merely provides for the sum fixed by the Secretary of War for this cemetery and needed to carry out the provisions of the mandate of Congress, a law passed some years ago. When Mr. Stimson was Secretary of War he wrote saying that the sum of \$605,240 would be the amount necessary to carry out the provisions of this law and provide for the construction of this cemetery. I hope my colleagues present will realize the seriousness of the situation and the urgency that faces us there in the Northwest for some place to bury the soldier dead. Before we had a single veteran of World War II there were 50,000 veterans in that area. There are a great many who are dying now, for many of them are getting old, veterans of the Spanish-American War, and a good many from World War I, and now we have the veterans of World War II; and yet there is absolutely no place for the soldier dead to be buried in a national cemetery in that whole area.

My amendment would provide the sum necessary to carry out the mandate of the law which we pass.

May I say also that President Roosevelt said he would not authorize a budget item for this by reason of the fact that he would not approve the payment of any Federal money for a cemetery site. In view of that fact, I conferred with the authorities in my State, and the legislature provided money for the acquisition of a site. The site was inspected and approved by the War Department and has been purchased by the State of Oregon. It is all ready for the construction to proceed and will be donated to the United States when construction is authorized. The only thing remaining to be done is the passage of this amendment so that construction of the cemetery may proceed.

I share the feeling of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who preceded me, with reference to our cutting out every single item possible in order that we may curtail the expenses of this Government if we are going to maintain the equilibrium of our financial structure; but it seems we owe some obligation to the dead, particularly those who fought our wars, and who desire when the Master calls them to be buried in the hallowed ground of their ancestors in their home community. Most of you have a veterans' cemetery in or near your district, but we have none there in that great Northwest country, and I plead with you today to approve this amendment so we may have this appropriation and have at least one national cemetery in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, if I were the only one involved in this matter, my good friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] would get this cemetery, and I would go out and help him build it; but the way the national situation with reference to cemeteries stands today, as you all know, we voted for a cemetery for each State and in States such as Pennsylvania, New York, perhaps Illinois and other heavily populated States, there will be two or three cemeteries.

There has been no estimate sent up here by the War Department for this or

given to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has sent nothing here. I may say, incidentally, that I do not blame my good friend for wanting this cemetery. They need it out there; but they need them at a lot of other places; and if we grant this request, it will only be right that we grant two or three dozen other requests by States in a similar situation.

In the State of Pennsylvania we had one-tenth of the soldiers in uniform in the United States Army, and I suppose we will have one-tenth of the deaths caused by the war, yet we do not have near enough cemetery space to take care of these people. I should not ask for it just now because we will have to wait until the Bureau of the Budget and the Army get plans made for these cemeteries throughout the Nation, and in different States, and send it up here.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that in the great State of Pennsylvania you have veterans' cemeteries which you have had for years. This is the only cemetery, as I understand it, that has been approved by the Congress itself and authorized to be constructed that has not been constructed. We have a letter over the signature of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, giving the amount of money that will be necessary for this cemetery which is the amount in my amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. I understand that. We have a cemetery, for instance, in Philadelphia for veterans, but it is filled. It has no more space. They have asked to go out 30 or 40 miles and buy additional space.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Debris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States, including maintenance of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois; for

payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 50 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized; for printing and binding, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing as may be authorized by the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress, and for the purchase in the fiscal year 1947, of not to exceed 550 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and 10 motorboats: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, \$112,883,250, including \$25,000 for the removal of the Upper Free Bridge over the Illinois River at Peoria, Ill.: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the congresses and of the Commission.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: Page 6, line 16, strike out the sum "\$112,883,250" and insert "\$97,883,250."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to strike out the Florida barge canal from this bill. This matter came up originally as a WPA project under the heading of a ship canal back in the WPA days, when its construction was defeated. During the war—I believe it was in 1942—when there was a great shortage of heating oil in the New England States, the bill passed Congress authorizing the construction of this canal, based upon an estimated cost of \$44,000,000. In 1943 an effort was made to obtain the appropriation. The proponents of the bill came before the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations asking for an appropriation to build the canal at a cost then estimated at \$44,000,000.

When I questioned them they said the purpose was to haul oil from the Texas oil fields to the east coast and the New England States. The proponents admitted at that time that it would have cost approximately \$450,000,000 to build the barges to haul 1,600,000 barrels of oil a day through the canal.

At that time Ralph K. Davies, formerly vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, was Deputy Fuel Administrator. At my request the Deputy Fuel Administrator, Mr. Davies, the man in charge of the transportation department, members of the War Production Board, and others appeared before our committee. They testified at that time—and you will find the testimony in the hearings—that the canal would cost \$44,000,000, but that it would cost \$1,500,000,000 instead of \$450,000,000 to build the barges, if the steel were available, to haul 1,600,000 barrels of oil a day through the canal. The hearings at that time disclosed certain other information on my questioning regarding the cost of transportation of oil, tonnage, and so forth.

We have now before us an appropriation to build this same canal at an estimated cost of nearly \$73,000,000, with a request by the Budget for us to appropriate \$20,000,000, which the committee cut down to \$15,000,000.

The same year, Mr. Chairman, that the committee turned down the Florida barge canal in 1943, we placed in the bill \$3,000,000 for plans and specifications. Despite the fact that Congress turned down this project, the War Department spent \$1,300,000 on surveys and plans on a project we had turned down. This was \$1,300,000 out of a total of \$3,000,000 provided for plans and specifications for the entire United States.

The total amount contained in this bill for rivers and harbors construction in all the 48 States is only \$52,000,000, yet the Budget Bureau comes in here and recommends \$20,000,000 of the \$52,000,000 for one project. This was cut by the committee to \$15,000,000. If we pass this bill as it is, \$15,000,000 out of \$52,000,000 will be spent this year, and \$73,000,000 will be tied up on the Florida canal and some other worthy projects will not be able to obtain funds, such projects as many of you have come to me complaining about.

The authorization bill was passed with an estimated cost of \$44,000,000. The annual tonnage given was 340,000 a year. General Wheeler, the Chief of Engineers, testified there would be more tonnage. "We are going to have a lot more tonnage, and a lot of it will be oil."

Mr. Chairman, the 1943 record showed—and I have it in these hearings—that it cost \$1 a barrel to ship oil through the canal by barge to the east coast. The wartime cost of transportation by tankers was 40 cents a barrel, and the peacetime cost by tankers is 21 to 24 cents a barrel. The pipe-line cost is 35 cents a barrel. They are going to talk about the cost of that pipe line. The pipe line paid for itself at 35 cents a barrel over the canal at a dollar a barrel if we had shipped the amount over the canal that we shipped through the pipe line. Those days the tankers were

being sunk and we were looking for a different method of shipping oil during wartime, but today it is not a question as between tankers and railroads or tankers and pipe line, it is a question of the difference in cost between two of the cheapest methods of transportation; that is, water transportation, the difference between the cost of transportation by tanker and by barge canal.

It is 2,400 miles to 3,000 miles from the Texas oil fields to the east-coast points. This means that these barges travel 2,400 to 3,000 miles at the rate of 4 to 5½ miles an hour, according to the testimony, and then they go back empty because you cannot haul anything in them but oil; so that is another 2,500 to 3,000 miles to haul empties. How in the world are they going to make the canal pay out hauling oil at a cost of a dollar or even 50 cents a barrel when the tankers are hauling oil for 21 to 23 or 24 cents a barrel?

It will be said here, Mr. Chairman, that the short haul will do it. There is no such thing as a short haul when it comes to hauling oil from Texas by barge canal. Those barges travel 1,100 miles before they ever strike the Florida barge canal. After they leave the barge canal they go hundreds of miles farther. Of course, you can take a barge and deliver oil at the various ports cheaper than you can by tanker, but you cannot haul oil long distances, 1,100 to 2,400 miles, and then distribute it more cheaply.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder just where the political pressure is coming from to make the War Department spend \$1,300,000 for plans and specifications on a project which the Congress turned down the same year that money was authorized to be spent? The War Department recommended \$30,000,000 for the Florida barge canal. I wonder where the political pressure is coming from which would induce the Budget to recommend \$20,000,000 out of \$52,000,000 rivers and harbors money for a Florida barge canal which has been turned down time and time again.

Mr. Chairman, I asked General Wheeler, "This canal is going to cost \$75,000,000. The interest charge on that alone is nearly \$2,250,000, and we are going to have to borrow the money to build this canal. How can you make it pay out?"

General Wheeler testified that the operating cost, including interest charge, would be \$2,500,000 for every year that that canal is operated after it is built. After mentioning larger possible tonnage, he came right back and said 340,000 tons is the actual tonnage. Regardless of what the proponents may say, that is the tonnage upon which the Rivers and Harbors Committee authorized that appropriation. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we take the figure of 340,000 tons a year and the cost of operating at \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000, what is this going to cost per ton? General Wheeler testified, and it is here in the record, that the cost would be from \$8 to \$9 a ton to transport freight by barge through the canal.

If you take four times the amount of tonnage that the Chief Engineer gave, you still have a cost of \$2 a ton in addi-

tion to the freight. And when you talk about shipping oil through the canal, there just is not going to be any oil shipped through there.

Talk about a short haul—the shortest haul you have before you get to the canal is 1,100 miles from the Texas oil fields to the proposed canal. Furthermore, you have to take your empties back. I ask this committee to turn down this project and adopt my amendment striking this \$15,000,000 from the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not require the 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the proponents or opponents of this project call it the Florida barge canal. The truth of the matter is it is a connecting link, and it should be so described. The only purpose for which I have brought this map here is to show how this cannot be considered as a local project. If this were a project in the State of Florida, if it were alone for my State, I could not afford to vote for it, because it would not serve a purpose and it would not be justified. But I want you to see from this map that this is a connecting link in a chain of waterways that has cost this Nation already over \$200,000,000 to develop.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Sometime I wish you would elaborate on that and show this House how a short-sighted policy in the development of the resources of America has cost us not only \$200,000,000 a year, but a billion dollars in the St. Lawrence seaway and power basin, where we have had to pay enormous freight rates to haul materials for ships that would have been hauled for one-tenth what it would have cost if that seaway had been in progress during World War II. I am for this project.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is certainly wise. We are penny-wise and pound-foolish when it comes to developing and protecting the natural resources of this Nation.

For once and all I want to spike this matter of a Florida barge canal. It is no such thing. It is a connecting link between two canals which, when completed, will be 2,500 miles long and will serve the entire Atlantic-Gulf seaboard of this Nation. If you will look at this map you will find when this canal is completed from Corpus Christi to Brownsville it will run all the way from the Mexican border of the United States to Florida, 12 feet deep by 100 feet wide, when they make some improvements. Then you jump across Florida, and from Florida to Trenton, N. J., you have another canal completed, an inland waterway of 2,500 miles in length, and when certain improvements are made, at a cost of over \$200,000,000, then we will have

a complete waterway all the way from Corpus Christi to Trenton, N. J. This is the connecting link. This is the gap that has kept transportation from going through. That is the only reason I wanted to use this map.

This affects not only the coastal canal but also the inland waterways up through the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. They have no way of getting across here. They must unload or go around the State of Florida, or go by rail transportation across the State.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is a close personal friend of mine. He has done me favors and I am willing to do him a favor at any time. We disagree on this project. I like the way he fights. He takes off his coat, rolls up his sleeves, and bangs away. That is exactly what I am going to do. I do not think he will disagree with me in that. He knows there is nothing personal in it. However, the gentleman made a lot of what Ralph K. Davies had to say when this was before the subcommittee in 1943. I would not believe Mr. Davies on a stack of Bibles as high as the Capitol.

The gentleman from Michigan says, "I am willing to take Mr. Davies' word." I want him to go back and read those same hearings in which he sat, and see where Mr. Davies told that committee: "If you will give us the things we have requested here, if we get the facilities we have requested, there will be no shortage of fuel on the Atlantic seaboard this coming winter." Those are his words and the words of Mr. Wilson and the words of Mr. Ickes, yet that coming winter we had the greatest shortage we have ever had in the history of the Nation. So if the gentleman from Michigan wants to rely on the figures of Mr. Davies that is all right, because his own statement belies him right there. The statement is in the record for the gentleman to see.

I do not see that Mr. Davies' statement about what it cost to build barges for the canals has anything to do with this appropriation. That was at a time when we were talking about having barges go through, hauling oil from the Gulf to the Atlantic seaboard. But at this time we are not talking about that. We are talking about linking up two great waterway systems.

I may say to the gentleman that the committee did not turn this canal down at that time because it was undesirable, they turned it down because Mr. Ickes said a pipe line would be the quickest and most feasible way of getting oil to the rest of the Nation. At that time I told the committee that if we constructed this waterway we would have something that would serve the people of this Nation in the future and would not have to be abandoned when the war was over. The committee, however, decided otherwise in their wisdom, and now we have pipe lines at a cost of over a hundred millions, which today are either to be junked or filled with sand, and nobody is going to use them. Had that money been spent on this connecting canal it would have been saved to the people of this Nation in the form of reduced transportation costs.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What depth of water is carried in the Atlantic portion of the canal system at the present time?

Mr. HENDRICKS. There are certain portions of it that have not been completed, just a small portion as I understand. It carries a depth of 12 feet, exactly the depth authorized for the construction across Florida to connect up these two canals.

Mr. BUCK. Twelve feet along the Atlantic portion of the system.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. BUCK. One other question, What is the relative cost of transporting a ton of oil by canal barge as compared with an ocean-going tanker between the same ports?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I shall be glad to answer that question because my friend the gentleman from Michigan brought it out. He insisted that General Wheeler answer this question about what it would cost. General Wheeler did state what it would cost but the gentleman from Michigan himself inserted the figures of between \$8 and \$9 per ton to be hauled by the barge canal. And the way he arrived at that figure was this, and I want you to follow me closely. I am sure my friend from Michigan does not intentionally mislead you, but he certainly did with those facts because here is the way he arrived at his figure: He took the lowest estimate of tonnage on this canal in prewar days of 340,000 tons, and he took the highest estimate of cost of the canal, which is now based on war costs and postwar costs. Then he gives the cost of maintenance and arrived at his figures of \$8 or \$9 a ton, which is absolutely incorrect.

I may point out to you here that this is the only project in the whole bill that will not be increased in cost. It came in here with the increase in costs figured by the War Department, taking into consideration the wartime high rate of wages and cost of materials. On all other projects the engineers themselves have stated there will probably be an increase of from 20 to 30 percent of the figures presented but on this one, instead of there being an increase, there will, if anything, be a decrease. So my friend from Michigan is wrong in the way he arrived at his figures by taking the lowest estimate of prewar tonnage and dividing it into the highest estimate of cost and maintenance. That gave him his figures of \$8 or \$9 a ton, but I say those figures are absolutely untrue.

I questioned General Wheeler, as you will find from the hearings, and you will find them in the record. He stated that when a tanker hauls from the point of production to the point of consumption that it will haul cheaper than a barge. But he also said that that applied only in a case where they would haul from Corpus Christi, Tex., for instance, and unload at Norfolk, Va. It did not include the cost of unloading from the tanker and reloading on tank cars, hauling overland, and unloading again, and reloading on barges in the canal for hauling to another point.

But he also said, and this is in the record too, that where you can use barges from the point of production to the point of consumption that the barges will haul cheaper than the tankers. The statistics in the engineers' office show that this statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that it seems rather unusual that when we talk about water transportation the statement always is made that we do not want to spend too much money, the question of economy is always raised. We should be economical, that is true, as the gentleman from Michigan has said. There is only \$52,000,000 in this bill for present construction and the engineers sent a budget of \$20,000,000 which was reduced to \$15,000,000 for the canal.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking about various forms of transportation. It is true, as has been said, that there are \$52,000,000 in this bill for construction, \$15,000,000 of which were allotted to the Florida ship canal. Let me say to the gentleman that I am going to offer amendments to see how far we want to go to spread these items in order to help other projects in here. I am willing to spread it out. Many Members have discussed the possibility of offering amendments putting projects in here. If they offer those amendments I think we ought to adopt them and I will tell you why. We ought to adopt those amendments for the reason that in the pioneer days of this country the Government gave millions of dollars' worth of land to the railroads. The Government subsidized railroad transportation and for what purpose? To benefit the people of this Nation, and that was proper. During the recent war the Government spent over \$1,000,000,000 in building airports throughout the country to be turned over to cities, municipalities, and communities. For what purpose? To be used by air transport lines to serve the people of this Nation. Just recently we passed a bill authorizing \$650,000,000 for the purpose of subsidizing air lines for air transportation in this country by building more airports. That should be done. We made an authorization of \$500,000,000 for public roads throughout this country, thereby subsidizing the bus lines and truck lines throughout the Nation. That is all right. We recently passed a bill which, in effect, turned back to the railroads of this country hundreds of millions of dollars because now the Federal Government does not take advantage of the land-grant provision and we have to pay the railroads for the freight they haul; that is justice. We are subsidizing every form of transportation in this Nation except the cheapest form—water transportation.

When we come to some little project here which will affect millions of people on the Atlantic seaboard and on the Gulf in the way of connecting those two great waterways, then we hear the state-

ment, "No; that is a little too much," and reference is made to it as a local project. It is no such thing. No one could defend it if it were purely a local project.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be perfectly fair. This project is for the benefit of the entire Nation. It is not for the benefit of the State of Florida. May I say to you also that when the engineers made their estimate of tonnage here they based it on on prewar days. They themselves state they did not take into consideration the long-haul value of transportation from over here to over there or from here back to there [indicating] but simply the local tonnage across the State of Florida. When I asked General Wheeler the question he said in the record of the hearings that that 360,000 tons would be doubled time and time again.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to you some statistics from the Bureau of Statistics of the Army engineers. Here are two projects on all fours. We did not consider any increased tonnage at all; that is, the gentleman from Michigan has not, and I want to read to you some statistics.

Here is one I want to read. Commerce on the Atlantic and Gulf Intra-coastal Waterway has grown rapidly for the past 10 years, depression years as well as war years, from less than 500,000,000 ton-miles in 1934 to 5,800,000,000 in 1944, an increase of 1,000 percent. Here is another intercoastal project on all-fours, and I refer to the Mississippi River intercoastal connecting canal by way of Plaquemine and Morgan City which has increased from 416,690 tons to 3,477,433 tons, an increase of 800 percent. When they begin hauling from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard it will increase by a thousand percent.

Mr. Chairman, shipping concerns have always opposed a canal, stating, "We will not use them." But it has always been true that when the canals were completed they did use them, and I am sure that will be true in connection with this particular waterway. Of course, Mr. Davies said he would not use it or that all the companies will not use it. But I will tell you the reason why they will not use it. I want to tell you people on the Gulf coast why they will not use it. One of the proponents of the canal was talking to an official of one of the big oil companies one day and he said, "Why, sure, it will save us every cent that you say and more, too," but he said, "It would lose \$150,000,000 for us annually." The proponent said, "How is that? I do not understand what you mean." He said, "How do you think we will control the price of petroleum if you open up the barge canal so that the independents can deliver to the consumers?"

Mr. Chairman, I could go on all afternoon, but if you read the record you will see that this project is justified.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the situation with reference to this particular barge canal is this, that originally, after long study, it was contemplated that the cross-State waterway from Fort Myers to Stuart was

the connecting link with the coastal waterways from Corpus Christi north. The engineers' reports so referred to it. In the days when the cross-State ship canal was surveyed, this particular route under consideration now was surveyed, and finally a report came in, but previously the Army engineers had approved the west coast intercoastal waterway along the west coast of Florida, then going across State from Fort Myers to Stuart. The total cost of that is only about one-tenth of this particular canal. The figures as given to you by the gentleman from Michigan are correct. Originally I had opposed the cross-State canal because of the fact that I thought it was economically unsound and because of the fact that it would greatly endanger the water supply of the State of Florida, and because of the fact we thought it was a Federal obligation to pay for the bridges.

The elimination of the sea-level canal and the provision for locks removed one of those objections but did not remove the objection of the economic unsoundness of it, because the canal, with one-tenth of the cost, by using the already approved waterway and the connecting link down the west coast of Florida. I do not say that because the connecting link is in my district. It was at one time but is not now. But it is still economically unsound to spend this vast amount of money for this barge canal at route 13B now. There are many projects approved in the River and Harbor Act passed this year and many projects which were approved by the engineers a number of years ago that are greatly needed.

There is \$15,000,000 for this particular project. There are many harbor and bay improvements in all southeastern United States, which were approved prior to this time, that are vastly more needed. I am in an embarrassing position of opposing this large amount of money in my own State. I said in all candor and frankness to the committee that there are many people in Florida who want it, but when we study the economic soundness of the project, it stands to reason that the money can be spent to far better advantage in Florida than in other places in the engineers reports approved and under survey.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not a fact that there is now a natural route over which such a barge canal could be built from Fort Myers through Lake Okeechobee and onto the Atlantic coast, on a very small program?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; from Anclote River at Tarpon Springs to Fort Myers, thence from Fort Myers through the Calvoosahatchee and Lake Okeechobee to Stuart, which would only cost approximately one-tenth of the estimated cost by using the regular waterways, knocking out bars and dredging some here and there.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the route that nature intended should be used.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is correct. The gentleman is familiar with the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Right along that same line, may I ask my colleague from Florida if this canal that he speaks of down in his district were completed, with the same depth and the same width, to connect the two intercoastal canals, what would it cost?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I may say first that it is not all in my district. The estimated cost is \$3,200,000 of that portion in my district for 8 feet from the Anclote to the Caloosahatchee.

Mr. HENDRICKS. For a canal 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide, to connect with the other two canals?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is the estimate.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am sure the gentleman will find it will cost far over \$100,000,000.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; that is also the connection from Fort Myers through Lake Okeechobee and the Caloosahatchee.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am speaking of the canal that will connect the two intercoastal waterways, at 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide. I am sure the gentleman will find it will cost over \$100,000,000.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; that is not correct. The figures have been developed from time to time. The 8-foot waterway would be made 10 feet at a cost of less than half a million, according to the Army engineers' report. The original report referred to it as a connecting waterway. The cross-State portion does not go through my district now, it goes through the district of my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], but I am familiar with the situation because I once represented that district.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How long has this question of a Florida barge canal been before the United States?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It was actually under consideration before Florida belonged to the United States. It was also discussed back in the old territorial days, and before there was a Territory. It has been surveyed and resurveyed, and there has never been a favorable report except in the hysteria of the war period. That is the situation. It is a question of the best expenditure. There is \$15,000,000 marked for expenditure here. There are other projects approved that need it far more. The improvement of the great harbors of Tampa and St. Petersburg, the smaller ones of Sarasota and Clearwater and a small expenditure on the Coatee River and at Tarpon

Springs, \$10,000 for a turning basin which is not included here but has been authorized would save more than that to the sponge industry in 3 months. Let us take first things first. When we have funds available that can be well spent for canals, then that is a different situation. This was authorized when they thought they would construct it during the war period, purely for the purpose of getting oil. It previously had been turned down time and time again.

In the printed hearing there was some confusion and possible misprint as to the use of the words "interstate" and "intrastate." The intrastate is generally known as west coast intracoastal canal. The bridges, for which I insist on the Federal Government paying, is the Cross State Canal, known now as Cross Florida barge canal.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much protesting against any improvement that comes to the State of Florida. I hesitate to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], but I believe in fair dealing, I believe that things that are first should come first.

This subcommittee recommended this appropriation, at a time when in my own district projects that have merit to them got absolutely no consideration. I have many such projects, but here are two, for example. There is a project known as Lake Worth Inlet in my district for the improvement of the port at Palm Beach. Congress authorized an appropriation of \$711,000, Public Law No. 14. The freeholders of the port of Palm Beach district, upon the assumption that this House was going to carry out what we passed and give them an appropriation of \$711,000, voted a bond issue of \$1,000,000. They have that money right now in the bank to make the improvements, yet this appropriation is not included in this appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Was any Budget estimate transmitted to the Congress for that project?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think so.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Appropriations does not consider projects until Budget estimates are transmitted.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I know that the Board of Engineers recommended it. They said it was a worth-while project. This House passed that bill authorizing an appropriation of \$711,000, but that appropriation is not in this appropriation bill. Now this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for a barge canal, which should not have priority over the amount authorized for the Lake Worth Inlet, and I am not in favor of this appropriation before our project, which has merit in it, has been included.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There are many Members on both sides of the aisle who came to me with worthy projects, just as the gentleman has. Unless we cut out some of these projects that the Bureau of the Budget has approved for some inexplicable reason and rejected others, such as the gentleman's project, we cannot put some of these others in. The fact of the matter is that the engineers report these projects, then the President comes down and sets a limit on how much money they can put in the Budget, and it comes down from the engineers with some of the projects, such as the gentleman has, being cut out and others are put in.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for that remark. I want to say that regardless of what the Budget or the engineers have said, that the House ought to stand behind a good project, and if they see something that is not right or has no merit in it, they should cut it out, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] said. You know and I know that if this amount is appropriated for these projects, then we cannot get these meritorious projects in the southern end of our State. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] has shown you that we have a waterway there, the canal from Stuart to Fort Myers, connecting us up. It is a wonderful waterway and should certainly have an appropriation prior to this one. It needs development and will not cost us much. I think this canal should get its appropriation before the barge canal and should be developed, as authorized by the Board of Engineers. When this is done, I will not oppose an appropriation for the barge canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may proceed for another minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's project, as I understand it, is included in the rivers and harbors bill which was passed last fall, and no appropriations are authorized under that bill until 6 months after the war. Therefore, there is no appropriation authorized for the gentleman's project at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do so understand the situation is as the gentleman states. Nevertheless, the gentleman from Georgia obtained an appropriation in a deficiency appropriation bill upon the theory that he would help us to get out a project if we voted for his project down there in Georgia. So I voted for the project.

Mr. TARVER. I never even heard of the gentleman's project until a few days ago and most certainly had no agreement with him of any kind.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the project referred to by my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I am not opposed to the project referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], but that project down there would not be worth anything to the intercoastal canal. I say that advisedly. I have been on the Rivers and Harbors Committee for many years and have heard all the testimony on this proposition.

The barges that would travel through the intercoastal canal could not go out through the Atlantic Ocean or through the Gulf of Mexico; and if you were to move down to the place they refer to in Florida to try to make a canal across Florida, still these barges that travel along the Atlantic seaboard and along the Gulf coast could not any more use it than they could cross the Peninsula of Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly will yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The contemplated canal, of which a portion has already been finished, goes down the west coast of Florida to the waterway which is Caloosahatchee which as used all during the war period for small barges and thus saved fuel for the Coast Guard to the extent of as much as the estimated cost of the canal.

Mr. RANKIN. Even if you get down the west coast of Florida, when you get out into the Atlantic Ocean, your barges could not travel, for the reason that they cannot operate in the open sea. The engineers have testified to that fact time and time again.

I am willing to assist the gentleman from Florida in any legitimate development, but I can tell you now you will never build this intercoastal canal to cross the peninsula at the point they indicate and make it carry the barges that travel along the Atlantic seaboard intercoastal route and the intercoastal route along the Gulf coast.

They cannot travel down the west coast of Florida, then cross and go out into the open waters of the Atlantic Ocean because the waves would sink them. Every engineer that knows anything about the barge business will tell you so. For that reason, as I said, I am willing to support the proposition of the gentleman from Florida when it comes up, but I am not willing to destroy this great link in one of America's greatest transportation courses merely in order that some time later we may develop a local project somewhere else in Florida, or at any other place.

I hope the amendment will be voted down and that this project will be developed so as to connect that great barge system, the intercoastal barge system along the Atlantic seaboard and the one along the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, because it will mean untold millions of dollars to the shippers of both sections of the country.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree to a limitation of debate on this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I may offer a substitute amendment, and in case I do, I wish to reserve 5 minutes on that amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. I will limit it to this amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will not object, provided it does not prevent me from offering a substitute and being heard on the substitute.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recorded the following gentlemen desiring to speak on this amendment, and will divide the time accordingly: Messrs. DONDERO, RICH, KNUTSON, SIKES, PRICE of Illinois, HENDRICKS, and SNYDER.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the Florida barge canal is not a new subject to the House or to me. I recall that on two previous occasions this House rejected the proposal. At that time the proposition was a deep water canal, of 30-foot depth. The present proposal is for a 12-foot depth canal.

The original estimate on the deep water canal was \$200,000,000.

The first estimate on the barge canal or the 12-foot depth was \$44,000,000. Now it is \$72,000,000.

The estimated tonnage to be carried on the canal has been given as 340,000 tons. Multiply that by four and the rate through the canal would still be about \$2 per barrel for oil. Mr. Davies testified that during the war 95 percent of all the oil that reached the eastern seaboard went by tanker, only 5 percent went either by rail or pipe line.

It must be evident to the House that the volume of traffic or commerce to go through the canal would be oil, and the oil tanker is the cheapest of all methods of transportation for this particular product. It costs from 22 to 25 cents a barrel to transport oil by tanker; about 35 cents a barrel by pipe line; and about \$1 per barrel by barge line.

It seems to me that such a proposal as this which cannot be justified economically should be voted down by the House at this time, particularly in view of the financial condition of the Nation. Some think when the volume of traffic and commerce warrant, it may be justified economically. Then let the House consider this project.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] will be approved and that this item of \$15,000,000 will be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it certainly does amaze me to see the great number of Members in the House of Representatives who talk economy, get up on the floor of the House and make speech after speech favoring economy, yet when an

opportunity comes along to save the money of the taxpayers of this country they do not vote economy. Where is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations? Let him get up here. He has been talking economy lately. Why is he not here doing something to help us economize in this instance? Why is not he here supporting an amendment that will cut an appropriation out of the bill?

To those of you who believe in economy, I say now is the time to vote economy. We must get at this at the source.

Those sponsoring this canal insist on it. I say there is no necessity for this canal today; the wartime need for it has passed, and whether it be the State of Florida or any other State in the Union, we should not increase our national debt at this time. To vote appropriations for projects which are not economically justified is nothing but absolutely silly. To those Members of Congress who want to try to get their particular projects in every bill that comes up, I say it is a time when actions speak louder than words.

Let us vote this down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman does not want to vote this amendment down; we want to vote this amendment up, for it strikes the item from the bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to strike the item from the bill, that is right. I want to cut out everything it is possible to cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, some of the discussion on the Florida canal has revolved about wartime costs and an effort is being made to use those costs to determine the canal's value. It might be well to remind ourselves that everything connected with the war effort cost a great deal more than it would have ordinarily. In war, it was victory that counted. We did not measure the cost and we did not use cost as the basis for determining whether a thing was good or bad. It was something we had to do and we saw it through.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the uncompleted gap in the two great coastal waterways, which extends across the State of Florida cost thousands of lives during the war, it cost a great many ships, it cost many hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil and of other vital war material. They were lost because of submarine action in the Gulf and in the Atlantic. The intra-coastal waterway, then as now, was only partially completed and we felt its need very keenly. It was not until we turned to barge shipments along the coast and to pipe lines that we bested the problem of fuel and heat. Perhaps we will never need the intercoastal canal across the State of Florida for defense purposes. Let us hope we shall not, but who can say whether we will or not. It is worth the investment from the standpoint of national security alone.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that we will only have 340,000 tons of commerce to move over the Florida barge canal. May I point out that those were prewar figures, arrived at before we had terminals at a time when there were but few tugs and barges utilized in those waters, when there were a number of uncompleted gaps in the intracoastal waterway. They have little relation to the present. During the war we saw what happened to other shipping figures, similarly arrived at, in the same area. They were expanded 10 times, 20 times, yes, as much as a thousandfold, Mr. Chairman. No, my friends, we have not completed the development of our waterways. We are only beginning. Let the records speak for themselves. You show me a completed waterway in this Nation, I will show you a resultant increase in trade, in economic activity, and in the prosperity of the people in the particular area.

I hold no particular brief for the cross-State canal. There are projects in my own district in which I am much more interested. Some of them are not included in this bill. But I seek the completion of our waterways pattern. Eventually, all of them will fit together, a monument to the foresight of Congress and a great asset to the Nation's economy and to its continued development. Because of its potential defense value, and because I am convinced that all of Florida, the Southeast, and the Nation will benefit from the link-up of our great waterway systems, I urge your support of this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we who represent the people of Florida come before you today in what some of my colleagues stated is a divided purpose because, really, this is not a selfish matter or a local project that we are before you with. I am sure that my colleague from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] has impressed you with the fact that this project affects the citizens of the Gulf coast as well as those of the eastern seaboard.

It should be brought to the attention of the House that there will be products other than oil hauled over this canal. I feel sure that the traffic will be a great deal heavier in other items than in oil. It has been proven before the committee that the project is economically sound. That has been brought out in the discussion and hearings on the bill. In my opinion, we can defend this project as a matter of national defense as well as an economic matter.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Something has been said about disagreement on the part of the people of Florida. Does not the gentleman think if we had a three- or four-prong canal, one running from Miami to Tampa and one from Jacksonville to Tampa, we would not have any disagreement?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. They are talking about their pet projects that have

been cut out of this bill. They are selfish. I have projects that have been cut out of this bill, but I am willing to go along and try to get the Florida barge canal because it will be really a grand thing for the whole seaboard and the Gulf coast.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The other projects are not out. They are in there too.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of the House will see fit to approve the appropriation for the construction of this barge canal across Florida. As we all know the authorization of this project was passed several years ago, in time for the canal to have been in operation during the war through which we have just passed. The canal would have saved this country untold millions of dollars during the war and hundreds of lives. It is indeed a shame that because of the pressure brought by selfish interests that this great sacrifice of lives and money had to be made.

To say that a hundred of our young men were called upon to give their lives does not register in the heat of this argument. But if there were those present who had lost a loved one on the coast of Florida during the time the German submarines were playing such havoc with our shipping, that could have been traveling across the Peninsula of Florida in the canal far removed from the hazards of war, of course the matter of the canal would be a matter of vital importance. I had no relative who lost his life because this canal was not in operation, but I did have a very dear friend who died in the burning oil when his ship was sunk off the coast of Florida. Nothing can be done that will correct this mistake that has cost so much money and loss of life, but we can appropriate this money in order that the canal can be constructed without further delay. It was definitely brought out in the hearings before the committee that the building of the Florida State barge canal was justified from an economic and from a national-defense viewpoint. The commercial value of this project was proved without a doubt, and I hope the House will give its approval to this worth-while appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS for the amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: Page 6, line 16, strike out "\$112,883,250" and insert "\$104,883,250."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care whether this amendment is adopted or not. I just want to bring to the attention of the House and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] as well as others who have spoken of the fact that if this amendment is not

adopted, it will be taking from others and it could be spent wiser on other projects. You may say that about any project in this bill. You can take the money from some other project and spend it on your particular project, if you want to be selfish about it.

The amendment I have offered reduces the amount in the bill by \$8,000,000. It takes \$5,000,000 off the Florida barge canal. It takes \$2,000,000 off the St. Marys River project in Michigan and \$1,000,000 from the project from Kansas City, Mo., to Iowa; therefore you have \$8,000,000 which I am perfectly willing that the committee adopt and take \$5,000,000 from me, \$2,000,000 from the gentleman from Michigan and \$1,000,000 from the people who want this waterway through Missouri and Iowa, and spread it out over these other projects. I do not care whether this amendment is adopted or not, but it shows how selfish we can be. I just want to bring to the attention of this House that anybody can offer amendments to provide money that can be taken from somebody else or my amendment. We have to decide these projects on what the engineers have stated, and the engineers have stated that the canal is feasible and economically sound, and they have also said that it has defense justification, and I would take the word of the engineers, and I think this project ought to stay in the bill and other projects put in also. There is nothing mysterious about the way this thing came here. It came here like every other project in the bill, and I do not like to have anybody insinuate that there was some mysterious manner in which it was put in. I believe this amendment of mine should be voted down and I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 103, noes 42.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for the purchase in the fiscal year 1947, of not to exceed 200 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with the flood control. \$110,814,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated

herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam.

OAHE AND RANDALL RESERVOIRS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I have previously discussed with him a paragraph which appears at page 7 of the committee report which deals entirely with some money recommended for reservoirs in South Dakota.

Mr. SNYDER. I recall that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the chairman have any objection to my placing that paragraph in my remarks at this point, modified as I suggested to him?

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have consulted my colleague from South Dakota. It has no relation to any project outside of the State. It does not affect the Budget recommendation so far as totals are concerned, but we think it would make a better division of the recommendation of the Budget.

The paragraph as it appears in the committee print reads:

The Budget estimates for projects in the comprehensive plan of flood control in the Missouri Basin include a recommendation of \$700,000 for continued planning on the Oahe Reservoir. Since the sum of \$200,000 for further exploration of sites and related questions of spillway and foundations was appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, and only recently has become available and final plans cannot well be made until those studies are completed, and since testimony before the committee made clear the urgency of establishing flood control for the lower basin at the earliest possible date, the committee believes that the \$700,000, which it is recommending should be added to the \$400,000 it is recommending for the Fort Randall Reservoir, the flood-control reservoir farthest downstream on the river, and that the combined fund should be available either for plans or construction of the Randall Reservoir. It is included in the appropriation total for flood control with that understanding.

Under the agreement now reached, the paragraph is modified to read as follows:

The Budget estimates for projects in the comprehensive plan of flood control in the Missouri Basin include a recommendation of \$700,000 for continued planning on the Oahe Reservoir. Since the sum of \$200,000 for further exploration of sites and related questions of spillway and foundations was appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, and only recently has become

available and final plans cannot well be made until those studies are completed, and since testimony before the committee made clear the urgency of establishing flood control for the lower basin at the earliest possible date, the committee believes that of the \$700,000 recommended for plans, \$600,000 should be added to the \$400,000 recommended for planning the Fort Randall Reservoir, the flood-control reservoir farthest downstream on the river, and that the combined fund should be available either for plans or initiating construction of the Randall Reservoir. The Budget amount for these reservoirs is included in the appropriation total for flood control with that understanding.

The listing in the table given in the committee's report on the bill, then, instead of reading—

Missouri River Basin:	
Sioux City, Iowa.....	\$20,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak. 1,	100,000

will read—

Missouri River Basin:	
Sioux City, Iowa.....	\$20,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak.....	100,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak. 1,	1,000,000

I thank the chairman and the committee for their consideration in this matter.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 8, line 5, strike out "\$110,814,000" and insert "\$113,814,000."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has for its purpose the increasing by \$3,000,000 the appropriation for flood control. The purpose of asking for the increase is to allow the engineers to commence work on the Whitney Dam on the Brazos River. The Whitney Dam was authorized by this Congress before the war. It was again authorized by the last flood-control bill. It has been authorized on two separate occasions by this body and by the other body. Twice the President of the United States has approved the authorization of this project. Twice has the Congress approved it.

This matter may not seem of much importance to some of you when compared with other improvements with which you are more closely associated, but it is of vital importance to those of us who live in the valley of the Brazos River, and I hope that we may have your serious consideration of the problem we have to present to you.

There are very few flood-control projects in the United States involving loss of life, but the figures show there have been 411 people drowned, died, lost their lives below the site of the Whitney Dam on the Brazos River. In addition to the loss of life, there is recurrent property loss which has been estimated to exceed \$100,000,000. The alluvial flood plain of the Brazos stretches for 300 miles from Whitney to the sea. It contains the most fertile land in our State. Every acre is subject to overflow.

This dam we are asking be commenced has been authorized for years. It is the keystone to the control of the largest stream in the State of Texas, a stream more than 1,000 miles long. I do not know of another stream in the United States of that length and which carries an equal volume of water that has not

had some kind of governmental assistance in stopping floods and in protecting people that live along its lower reaches. The depredations of the Brazos have been such that the Legislature of Texas in 1929 created a district involving all of the drainage basin of the Brazos. The first stream valley in the United States ever organized as an entire valley was organized by the Legislature of Texas in 1929 as the Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District. In 1935 the State of Texas appropriated \$6,120,000 for the control of floods on this stream, and approximately \$5,000,000 of State money has been put into this work—not promised, but put into it. We are asking now that the Federal Government make a start on the work that has been promised year after year and year after year. After we have put our own money into it, and after we have relied upon the promises that have been made, we believe that we have a meritorious claim on your consideration.

I am especially familiar with this work for I was a member of the Texas Legislature which provided State assistance 11 years ago. In fact, I drew the bill that made State participation possible. At that time we expected the Federal Government to at least aid us and not to discriminate against us because of the effort of our local people. We have, however, been chagrined to find the Federal Government appropriate freely for all manner of projects where the local people contributed nothing, and yet refuse to give the Brazos one red cent. We believe we have a project that actually involves more real flood loss than any project we know of in the United States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does the bill specify this stream?

Mr. POAGE. No, because the bill does not specify any streams. The bill simply provides a lump sum to carry out authorized projects. This is an authorized project. Of course, we feel in all fairness that should this House adopt this amendment, the engineers would recognize it was for the purpose of commencing this project.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The point I was going to make was that if the engineers saw fit, they might use that money for some other approved project.

Mr. POAGE. They might.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do you not think you had better amend it so that you will get the relief you want?

Mr. POAGE. We do not think so because we have confidence in the sincerity of the engineers. As a matter of fact, the entire bill provides so much money in one lump sum. There are no projects specified by name. I have already submitted this amendment to the Parliamentarian, and he has approved its form.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I will state that the engineers have never violated the confidence of Congress. When they are given money with the under-

standing that it will go into certain matters, although they are not bound by law to do so, they have never violated that understanding.

Mr. POAGE. We are not afraid to trust the engineers in this matter. All we ask is that this House give us an opportunity to commence work on a project which means more to 10 great congressional districts in Texas than any other one project I can think of; a project about which there is no difference of opinion; a project on which all of our people are united; a project on which our State government is united; a project on which every Congressman up and down the stream is united; a project on which there is unanimous accord. Let this House not withhold approval of this undertaking. There is no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will accept 2 minutes, I will not object but I must object to 3 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. If the chairman wants to cut me off, I will have to accept his terms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we must be limited in the discussion of a project that is of such vast importance. We properly discussed at some length a very important project in another section just before this amendment was considered. It was entitled to full consideration, but the drainage basin of the Brazos River is larger than the entire State of Florida. Bear in mind that the drainage basin of that river is larger than the Tennessee Valley. There is not one single Federal structure to prevent floods on that whole great thousand miles of river.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to corroborate the statement made by the gentleman. All of us who live in that section, and my own district is partially in that watershed, are all united in the feeling that this is perhaps the most urgent project in the whole State of Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Everybody agrees on that. I repeat we have no division on that subject. Let us have the funds we need that we may start this work and get it under way. We hope to prevent floods that are killing people. You come to us and make appropriations of money to prevent floods that destroy property. Yes, our floods destroy property, too, but we have 411 corpses that we could lay out before you. I do not know where you are going to find that sort of a situation on any of the 500 other streams which the chairman states are just like this one. I want to plead with this House to give us an opportunity to commence a great program on a great stream system and that you not discriminate against this system. We do not know why it was left out. We are not coming here charging anybody with anything

and we are not criticizing anyone. But an injustice has been done and we want this House to rectify that injustice.

I came to this House about 10 years ago. One of my first efforts was directed toward the authorization of a survey of this project. I was successful. The survey was made. The Corps of Engineers gave a favorable report. The Congress authorized the project. The State of Texas spent its \$5,000,000 in good faith. I relied, my colleagues relied, our people relied on the repeated assurances that this dam would be built just as soon as the war was over. Together with my colleagues, Hon. LUTHER JOHNSON, Hon. SAM RUSSELL, Hon. GEORGE MAHON, Hon. TOM PICKETT, Judge MANSFIELD, and others were advised just before Christmas not to harass those in authority—that the appropriation would be in the regular appropriation bill. I know that within the last 6 months it has become apparent that there will not be the widespread unemployment this spring and summer which was anticipated, and that as a result the Budget has cut two-thirds to three-fourths off the estimates for public works including flood control, but this is not and never was a make-work project. It is a project which should stand and can stand on its own merits.

I plead with you to correct the injustice that this bill does and to give us enough money to get this great project started.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to disagree, or be opposed to this amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Texas, but I think all of you within the sound of my voice know the situation, that there are more than 500 projects in the United States, many of them in California, Pennsylvania, in fact, in most of the States of the Union, in exactly the same status as the one we are talking about, just as important to those people as this one is important to the gentleman from Texas. So it would be inconsistent for us to adopt his amendment today applying to that particular case. We want to be consistent on all these projects and treat every Member of this House fairly.

The Bureau of the Budget has had this before them for a number of years. They turned us down. They did not send it to us.

It is said in answer that the Army engineers have made a recommendation on it. Certainly. They send in recommendations on items totaling more than a billion. But we do not have the money to cover them all, and the Bureau of the Budget together with the Corps of Engineers decided that they would send up only those incorporated in the bill. They left our projects in my district as well as in the State of Texas.

So I ask the Committee to vote the amendment down.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I accept the challenge of the chairman of this subcommittee when he says there are 500 other projects in the United States that are in the same situation. I challenge the accuracy of that statement, because there is no other project where they can show the loss of as many lives from lack of flood control as is shown on the Brazos River.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I challenge the gentleman's statement.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Name a place.

Mr. SNYDER. The Pittsburgh district on the Ohio River.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And they got the money too, did they not?

Mr. SNYDER. They did not get the money, they only got one-third of it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. We did not get any. Give us one-third and we will be satisfied.

I still challenge the gentleman's statement and say there is not another project as worth while and necessary from the standpoint of the saving of human life.

In this connection let me point out that my State has already spent more than we are asking the Federal Government to give. Texas has already appropriated \$6,000,000 and spent \$5,000,000 trying to control this stream. All we are asking for now is \$3,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman says all he is asking is \$3,000,000?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is all we are asking for now.

Mr. SNYDER. How much will it take to complete it?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. What we want is to start it.

Mr. SNYDER. It must be completed or the money invested in it will be lost.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It will take, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, \$20,000,000 to complete it, but that is to be spread over a period of years. What we want first is money to start our project and let us begin work on it.

Mr. SNYDER. It will take \$200,000,000 before the thing is finished.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Are we talking about the same project? The estimate of the Army engineers, after a careful survey, is that \$20,000,000 will complete the Whitney Dam on the Brazos River, and that is what I am talking about.

Mr. SNYDER. Why did not the gentleman go down to the Bureau of the Budget and speak to them down there about getting this amount included for this project?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Those of us interested in this project, and remember there are 10 Texas congressional districts affected by it, had every reason to believe that in view of the very favorable report made by the Army engineers that it would undoubtedly be included by the Bureau of the Budget, and when we learned that it had not been included we did go to the Bureau of the

Budget and vigorously protest its omission. Those who did go besides myself were my colleagues Mr. POAGE, Judge MANSFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MAHON. My colleague, Mr. POAGE, myself, and others of the Texas delegation have been active for a long time in this matter. We know that there is no flood control project more badly needed in any State of the Union than the building of Whitney Dam on the Brazos River and we are now here asking for help on this meritorious project which has been thoroughly examined, surveyed, and approved by the Army engineers. The State of Texas has already spent \$5,000,000. We are asking for only \$3,000,000, and I hope we will be supported and this amendment adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, let me say furthermore that there is no division of opinion in Texas about the necessity or the value of this project. The Brazos River and its overflows affect 10 congressional districts in the State of Texas and the Whitney Dam is the key in the control of floods on that stream. We are all back of the project, the State of Texas is back of it, and we need the money to get started to save human lives. On the basis of the humanitarian plea, if there is nothing else that can be used as an argument justifying this appropriation, I ask you to give us this appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, most usually you find me on the side that is trying to save money. You know I grew up so poor down there in this district where the Brazos River runs that I reckon I learned the value of money.

This is one amendment that I think this House in justice ought to pass.

The Brazos River runs through my district. Until yesterday afternoon I had been led to believe by everybody that there was no question but what the appropriation was going to be made to start the Whitney Dam.

As told you by my colleagues, we are not asking it upon a charity basis, because we have done something ourselves, we have spent \$5,000,000 of the Texas taxpayers' money trying to curb the river.

Let me make you this promise: If you will pass this amendment and get this Whitney Dam under construction the State of Texas is going to spend more money, a lot of our money, in order to handle the situation. You are not going to handle it by yourselves. We are going to do our full-fledged part.

This is a project that is believed in by everybody who knows anything about it; they could not possibly disbelieve in it, they would have to back it. If you vote for this amendment and let it be carried you will find it money well spent. As my colleague from Waco said, we have something to show on our part, and I think

we have something to show you of the damage done by the floods in this district that is as large as most of the States. We are only asking you to give us a little to start with in addition to what we are going to spend. Please help us to put this dam over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move, to strike out the last four words.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] went on to refer to a large number of other projects over the country that also are entitled to consideration. But now is the time to consider them. We are in the postwar period, and if we are ever going to promote a program of internal development in America now is the time.

Mr. Chairman, you are soon going to be asked to vote about \$4,000,000,000 for Great Britain; then you are going to be asked to vote about \$6,000,000,000 for Russia; then you are going to be asked for two and a half billion dollars for Italy; then you are going to be asked to vote three and a half billion dollars for France, and many billions to other countries.

Now you are being asked to appropriate money for a worth-while project on the Brazos River in Texas, United States of America. It is about time we look after the internal affairs of America and make it possible for our own people to live in our own country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Well, the gentleman refers to all that money we are going to be asked for. Can the gentleman or any other Member of Congress tell me where we are going to get the money?

Mr. RANKIN. I can tell the gentleman where we are going to get the money to develop the Brazos River if this amendment is adopted. We will get it right here in America where we will have to get the money to pay these foreign debts.

Mr. RICH. You are not going to get the money to pay these foreign debts. If you keep on you are going to wreck the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not misunderstand me; I am not advocating those foreign

loans. But I am advocating this improvement.

The development of this project on the Brazos River will add 10 times as much to the wealth of America as it will ever cost.

Mr. RICH. I have heard Members on that side of the aisle talk about doing that for the last 12 years. Where have you got us? You have us \$269,000,000,000 in debt. You are going to swamp us. If you do not do something pretty soon to stop this it will be all over over here.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is talking about money that has been spent in a foreign war. Do not ever get the idea that the people of Texas are a burden, or that the State of Texas is a burden, on the United States.

Mr. RICH. I am not talking about Texas any more than I am talking about Mississippi or Alabama or Florida or Tennessee or those States that have been getting everything out of the Government and not putting anything back.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is just a question whether or not you want to let the internal development of America go down or whether you want to keep the pace along which we started toward making this the greatest country the world has ever seen. This project will not be a dead burden on the people of the United States. The truth of the matter is that this Brazos River project will be a money maker in the long run.

Mr. RICH. If it were only this project you were asking for, if that were the only thing, I would say give it to them, but you have your finger in the pie all the time, you have pie smeared all over your face; the only trouble with you is you do not want to stop.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not pie you see on my face; it is just a smile over the success of the TVA and other similar improvements.

This project is down in the State of Texas. I have no financial or political interest in the State of Texas any more than any other individual American. I do know that this is a worth-while project. I have gone over it time and again, and I say the House can make no mistake in approving it.

I am surprised at my distinguished economic friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] opposing a project that means so much to the people of the State of Texas, and one which will not be a burden on the American people as a whole.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that the Army engineers have shown that we lost \$103,000,000 last year in flood damages and if this appropriation and other flood-control appropriations will save some of that \$100,000,000, it will be money in the bank.

Mr. RANKIN. Those men who have opposed me for the last 15 years on the internal development of America's water resources overlook the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of lives are destroyed by floods

every year because we did not develop projects of this kind.

Mr. RICH. If these members from Texas will vote for this appropriation to give this money to help Texas, how many of those Members from Texas will vote to give Great Britain \$3,000,000,000; how many of them will vote to give \$6,000,000,000 to Russia; how many will vote to give away other money; how many will vote to bankrupt us in trying to save these other nations of the world? Why do they not do something for America?

Mr. RANKIN. They want to take care of Texas, just as the gentleman takes care of Pennsylvania, and I want to take care of Mississippi. But this is a Federal project on one of the longest rivers in America, and it is our duty to develop it just as we have done on the other great rivers of the country.

This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how long it has been since I addressed a committee of the House, but, may I say, during the 29 years I have been a Member I believe I have said less than any other Member of the House. I never talk unless I have something to talk about that I know something about.

The project under consideration here was authorized in a flood-control bill before the war. During the war we asked for no appropriations for it, that I recall. If there was a request made it was not called to my attention.

If there ever was a meritorious project for flood protection I know that this is one of them. If there is anything I know it is something about the rivers and harbors of this country. I have been working on them for 29 years. I know the conditions on nearly every river in the United States to a certain extent.

Mr. Chairman, this river is practically 1,000 miles long. Its headwaters are across the State line in New Mexico, up in the Great Plains region. It flows southeast a thousand miles into the Gulf of Mexico.

In the great flood of 1913 the Colorado River and the Brazos River flowed together down in the Coastal Plains. They both flowed into an intervening stream known as the San Bernard River. The river was 63 miles wide at that point, not continuously, but from its eastern edge to its western edge the width was 63 miles. The valley of the river on the lower 175 miles ranges from 3 to 15 miles in width and consists of very fine, fertile land.

Every acre in that area overflows every few years whenever we have an extremely heavy rainfall. The damage in the past has run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. The loss of human life has been enormous. I have seen people floating down the river on fragments of driftwood, who had to be hauled out. I have been present when they brought in 40 or 50 Coast Guard boats from the Gulf to rescue the people and save their lives. We have spent millions and hundreds of millions of dollars on projects that to my positive

knowledge are not half as meritorious as this one. The trouble is that this is not a power dam. It is a flood-protection dam. If it had power connected with it we would have thousands of people all over the country clamoring for it, as a matter of course. But it is strictly for the protection of property and for the protection of human life.

I hope that the committee will authorize the commencement of this work. I do not remember when it was authorized, but it was several years ago, and it has been lying dormant on account of the war. My district will not get a cent out of this bill, and I am not asking for it, because I know what the committee has been up against. But this is a thing that ought not to be neglected any longer.

BRAZOS RIVER PROJECT

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment. This river does not touch the district that I have the honor to represent, but I know it is a worthy project.

DEPLORE SECRET HEARINGS BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

One of the reasons I asked for this time is to deplore the system we have in this House in the Committee on Appropriations. I am not criticizing the present members of the Appropriations Committee. Doubtless the system has been handed down or inherited. Anyway, I think it is undemocratic. I think it is unfair to the other Members of Congress. Here is a case where a committee gets together and they hold what might be construed star-chamber proceedings—at least, secret sessions, and only certain members, members of the subcommittee, are privileged to attend. If another Member of the House makes a request to get in and attend the hearing, he is denied that privilege.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Any Member can appear before my committee at any time and stay as long as he wants to.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. Can he stay there and listen to other witnesses?

Mr. SNYDER. No, sir; he cannot.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, then, that is what I am complaining about. That is undemocratic, according to my opinion.

Mr. SNYDER. No; it is not a star-chamber proceeding.

Mr. PATMAN. You do not advise them what is going on, do you?

Mr. SNYDER. That rule has been in force since the days of George Washington.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not care in whose time it commenced. It is undemocratic. I am not complaining about any present member of the Appropriations Committee. I commend all of them for faithful, able service, but I still say the system is wrong. Here is a committee that gets into a room, closes the doors, and we must assume they have their biases and their prejudices just the same as other Members of this House, and if they hap-

pen to be biased in favor of certain projects they can build up a case if they want to—I do not say they have—to bring to this House and substantiate what they have reported. If they are against certain projects it is possible for them to build up their case to suit their own feelings in the matter. I do not think it is fair to allow such privileges, even though up to now they have not been abused. I do think it is undemocratic. I think it ought to be changed. Here we are always opposing undemocratic things. Let us know what is going on. Let us have no secret undertakings here among our own colleagues when testimony of witnesses is being taken. We are denying our own colleagues the privilege of knowing what is going on in those secret committees. I do not think it is right. I think it is wrong, and this is a fine example of what can happen at a secret session. After all testimony is taken, it would be all right for the committee to have an executive session to pass on it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. There is not a scintilla of truth in what the gentleman is saying, and the gentleman knows that better than any man in this House.

Mr. PATMAN. The statement I made is absolutely true.

Mr. RABAUT. No; it is not presented correctly.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a minute; let us get this straight. Is it not a fact that you will not let Members get in there and hear other witnesses? Is that not a fact?

Mr. RABAUT. No; it is not a fact. If Members wish to testify they may arrange to come to testify when other witnesses are present on the same project.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the chairman of the committee said so. He is your chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, well; that has been a rule for a long time.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not care how long it has been here; it is wrong. I do not care how long it has been, I say it is wrong, and they admit it and you have to admit it.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I do not admit it.

Mr. PATMAN. You will not tell anybody what goes on there until the bill comes out on the floor. You hold your secret sessions, you make your case, and you do not let any Member of this House know what is in your report until you bring the bill up on the floor. When you bring the bill up, then you give us the benefit of what you want us to know. I am not charging any unfairness. I deplore the system regardless of who started it and when. It should be changed.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is not?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not; I am just telling you the possibilities. I am not attacking any Member, just the system. That is my personal opinion. If the gentleman wants to defend that secret system, that is up to him, but I want to deplore the fact that we have a secret system here in our House of Representatives that will deny our colleagues the

privilege and opportunity of knowing what is going on affecting their own districts.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has made some pretty broad statements here.

Mr. PATMAN. No. I do not like it a bit. It is unfair, it is not democratic.

Mr. RABAUT. Is it a policy of the committee or is it a rule of the House under which the Committee on Appropriations acts?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not care whether it is a rule of the House, it is just as wrong. I do not care if it has existed 100 years, it is still wrong. I am not blaming any Member, I am not criticizing any Member, I am denouncing it as wrong and as undemocratic.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. In view of the fact that I think the gentleman's statement was so unfair to this committee, may I ask the gentleman if the Committee on Appropriations has ever refused to hear him before any subcommittee?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it only came about this way.

Mr. NORRELL. This subcommittee has not refused to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. The policy of the committee is not to let any Member come in but the committee members, and we do not know what is going on. It came to my notice several years ago when I complained about it. They were just slaughtering the Farm Security Administration. I thought I could come over here and stay and hear the witnesses. I came and testified. Although treated with every courtesy, when I mentioned about remaining in the committee room, I was told, "No; you have to go out now; we are going to hear the other witnesses." "Can I wait and find out what is being brought up against it?" "No; you cannot do that. You will get that information when the bill comes before the House; then and not before." Imagine a Member of this body being denied the right to know what is being presented in the way of testimony concerning a problem he is vitally interested in.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that on two occasions I had the pleasure of appearing before this committee, and before this morning I knew what I had in my own congressional district, and I found out by going down to the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. That is fine.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have no complaint to make. I just want to make that statement.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not attacking any member of this committee, I am just attacking the policy. I think it is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to contribute to making this a Texas day, but as a member of the

subcommittee I do want to testify, to the vigorous and continuous and persistent efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], and other Members who are interested in this project. It would probably have been in the deficiency bill last December except for a lapse of a few days. The Army engineers did not have their plans quite ready to go. Shortly after the deficiency bill was presented they had their plans ready to go. I talked to General Wheeler yesterday. He is ready to go. He is for the project and everything is all set. It is a project of great merit. While it is not in the Budget, it is in the recommendation of the Army engineers. It vitally affects my State. May I respectfully request the very serious consideration of the House on this important project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague just said that General Wheeler was ready to go on the project. He is ready to go on 500 other projects like this. I ask that the Committee vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 62, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 8, line 5, strike out the figures "\$110,814,000" and insert "\$111,816,300."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I probably may be considered a brave fellow to undertake another amendment like the amendment of my good friend from Texas, which was defeated a moment ago, but I am doing exactly that. The only difference is that my amendment embraces smaller projects than his, and if my good friend from Texas will pardon me for disagreeing with him, I think my projects are perhaps the most meritorious projects in the Nation.

In my amendment I seek to increase the sum of \$110,814,000 provided for flood control on page 8, line 5, to the sum of \$111,816,300. The object of this amendment is to include two projects in the district which I have the honor to represent. These projects are as follows:

The Pineville, La., project: The plan of improvement provides for the enlargement of 0.8 mile of levee on the Pineville city front; the enlargement of the Louisiana and Arkansas bridge approach fill; the construction of 0.6 mile of new levee and the construction of one floodgate. It also provides for the enlargement of 0.5 mile of existing levee in the Rocky Bayou loop. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Amount of estimate for 1947 was \$128,300.

The Aloha-Rigollette project: The plan of improvement provides for the enlargement of the authorized levee along the Red River between miles 171

and 151 above the mouth; extension of the levee along the Red River from the north bank of Bayou Darrow to the hills on the south side of Bayou Rigollette, mile 125 above the mouth; construction of a drainage ditch, two floodgates, and the provision of sump storage areas at the mouth of Bayou Darrow and at the mouth of Bayou Rigollette; improvement of Bayou Rigollette from the vicinity of United States Highway No. 71 to the mouth by clearing and snagging of the old channel; and construction of an embankment at the head of Bayou Darrow to isolate the Bayou Darrow and Bayou Rigollette drainage areas. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Estimate for 1947 was \$874,000.

You will thus see that I ask to add \$128,300 to start the project first named and the sum of \$874,000 to start the second project.

I say to the gentlemen on my left, some of you manifested interest when I spoke on this floor a few months ago about the flood on Red River in 1945 when much of that valley was ruined with several feet of water. I drove over the country in a motor boat and had to duck my head when I went under the telephone wires which were over the railroad tracks. I appeal to you gentlemen on the left. I beg you. I want to importune like the importunate widow in the Bible, if I may. I plead with you. Let these two small projects go into this bill. They were authorized back in 1941. One of them is near the city of Pineville. Just above there is splendid land, yet it is overflowed, and it may be overflowed again if you do not put these projects in this bill.

Both of these projects have been approved by the Engineers. The Engineers are ready to proceed with the work. These projects, like the project presented by my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], were left out of the bill by the Bureau of the Budget. Of course, that was done at the behest of the administration. We all understand that the administration determines how much money it can spend for this or that purpose in a given year, and the Budget Bureau simply cuts out enough projects to bring the sum in line with what the administration determines it can spend. The chairman of the committee has just told us that the Budget Bureau cut out about 500 projects which had formerly been approved by Congress and the engineers. But it seems to me that this is a thing for Congress to decide.

May I ask this House, in all seriousness, who is running this Congress? Who is running the country? The elected representatives of the people or the Budget Bureau that knows nothing about a single project? The Budget Bureau has no opportunity to weigh the merits or demerits of the project as have Members of Congress, yet they cut out 500 good projects, including the two I am now discussing. Then the Appropriations Committee takes the position that it will not put in any projects that have not been approved and recommended by the Budget Bureau. As I understand it, the Budget Bureau, representing the ad-

ministration, takes the position that it cannot begin any new projects right now that were not included in the deficiency bill late last year. They therefore refuse to put in any new projects and turn a deaf ear to 500 projects, which the chairman has just admitted a few minutes ago. Frankly, I do not like the way this is handled. I am doing what I can to stop this procedure.

Who is running this country? Is it being run by the Congress?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield right there? I will tell you.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I will tell you who is running the country. The New Deal administration has been trying to run the country, and if you do not watch out, they are going to run it into a hole.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman knows I am not a New Dealer, and never have been. I am a southern Democrat and I am contending for the rights, prerogatives, and authority of Congress, and I ask the gentleman to support me in that.

Now, I appeal to you Members to go along and help me put these projects in this bill. The House has just turned down the amendment of my friend from Texas [Mr. POAG], but I hope that you will not visit that fate upon my amendment, for I consider my amendment most meritorious.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. It is not flood control that is ruining this Government or this administration or this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank my colleague. No; it is not what we are spending for flood control. Our expenditures for flood control are not too large. Those expenditures are investments.

Now, it has already been said on this floor that you are going to be asked to make great loans to Great Britain, to Russia, and to other nations.

How can this administration ask us to do that and at the same time deny flood-control money for our own internal deserving projects? Suppose there are 500 projects deserving and left out, as the chairman says. They have all been carefully considered by the Flood Control Committee and by the Army engineers and declared worthy. They are important to their States and communities.

Let me say this to you people from the industrial sections: I hope with all my heart that I may be able to appeal to you so that, at least, if you cannot vote with me, please sit down. Please vote with me or sit down for once, because I am appealing to you as one whose people need this relief. They cannot get relief unless you gentlemen come to their rescue. We have no large industrial projects like you have up North.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I need three additional minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Very well; we will give it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Now, we have no industrial plants down there, and we need these two small projects to help our employment situation, in addition to the need for the protection from floods. We have had a lot of veterans return. As I stated, we have no large industrial plants. We cannot secure industrial jobs for all of them. Ours is largely an agricultural section. Get up and vote against this project if you want to, but remember you are turning down veterans who need this work.

Let me tell you something. Now is the time we should have these projects. If we ever needed projects like this, we need them now. We have had no work done for four long years during the war. Like all other sections, we have remained patient. Now we have got veterans down there who need these jobs, who are finding it hard to secure proper jobs. The inclusion of these projects will not only help solve our flood problem, but it will be a great blessing to our returning veterans.

I plead with you gentlemen that we may have this. We ought not only to begin these two projects, but I think we ought to do our best to begin as many projects as we can as soon as we can to meet the situation which I have just described. I know there are other deserving projects. The chairman says there are 500 and he seems to feel that they are all deserving. That may be. No doubt they are. But these two projects are urgent. To fail to include them in this bill just puts them off that much longer. I serve notice that I am going to hammer away with all my power until I do get them included. I will drive at every appropriation bill that comes up for flood control until it is done. But we need it now. The flood protection may be needed again soon and the veterans need the work now. Why, Mr. Chairman, if there are 500 deserving projects that were left out, as the chairman of the committee advises us there were, then it is obvious that only a handful of projects will be started, for this bill covers only a handful of projects, compared to the 500 he says were left out.

A few minutes ago this House in its wisdom cut out a project for \$15,000,000. Now that that was cut out, Mr. Chairman, I say let us put a part of that \$15,000,000 back in the bill where it is badly needed and where it will be of great help to veterans and all other people. The sum that the House has just cut out will take care of a lot of these other worthy projects.

We need your help. I beg you, I beg you gentlemen on my right, I beg you gentlemen on my left, stay with me and write this project in the bill.

I thank you.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like a minute and a half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am always entertained by the inflammatory pronouncements of my flamboyant friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. And his invectives today are particularly unrestrained. "The Committee on Appropriations is unfair. It is unjust. It is undemocratic." The indictment is characteristically Patmanesque.

The complaint seems to be that the Texas delegation has not been allowed to sit in on the hearings on this bill, and therefore has been denied a particularly delectable piece of pork.

Now, I am constrained, reluctantly, to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas. The great State of Texas and the Texas delegation have not been discriminated against in the matter of admission to the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. In fact the Texas delegation has had the advantage in that respect over every other State in the Union. For Texas alone of all the States has two members on the Committee on Appropriations. No other State has more than one. Some States have none at all. But Texas has two. And Texas therefore has twice the representation at the meetings of the committee that any other State has. On the subcommittee that conducted the hearings and formulated this bill Texas had a representative while 40 other States of the Union had none. There never was a session of the subcommittee or of the whole committee at which the Texas delegation was not represented.

Furthermore, Texas has more chairmanships than any other State in the Union, and the Speaker in addition. And every chairman, and the Speaker in particular, reflect honor upon the great State which they so ably represent. We are glad and honored to have these two Texans on the committee. They are among the most valuable members of the committee. But certainly it is startling, to say the least, to hear the gentleman's contention that Texas has not sat in on this bill or any other appropriation bill.

And Texas has not been neglected in this bill. This bill carries more money for Texas than for any other State in the Union. States with vastly larger rivers receive less. No State in the Union has as much money in this bill as Texas. And yet the gentleman from Texas is not satisfied. He is so accustomed to monopolize committee assignments, committee chairmanships, House and committee patronage and Federal appropriations that he is never satisfied. Like Oliver Twist, he continually cries for more. And when he does not get more and more and more, he begins to abuse the committee and its procedure. "The committee is unfair. The committee is unjust. The committee is undemocratic."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I only have 2 minutes. If the gentleman will give me more time, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. PATMAN. I only complained about the procedure and the secrecy. Will the gentleman deny that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; I am going to talk about that if the gentleman will just give me the time. He had 5 minutes and I have 2. He not only wants to monopolize the committee assignments and the chairmanships and the appropriations, he also wants to monopolize the time.

The sessions of the Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittees are not secret. They are executive. Everybody is admitted who has any business before the committee. Everybody is heard who asks to be heard. The hearings are published in full and are free to anyone who asks for them. There is nothing secret about them.

But the committee is a workshop. It is not a bull pen for daily exhibitions. It deals in facts and figures and works under continuous pressure 6 days in the week, mornings and afternoons. It cannot have its work interfered with by idle spectators and lobbyists. If it did it would be delayed indefinitely in getting its bills to the floor.

The same is true of the Committee on Ways and Means and other committees of the House. They do not admit spectators. And yet I have never heard the gentleman condemn them because he could not walk in and bring influence to bear whenever he had a pet project before them. And although the Committee on Appropriations has repeatedly brought in appropriation bills this session he has never expressed his discontent with its procedure until today. Perhaps allowance should be made for his pique at being pushed—as gently as possible—from the “pork barrel,” from which he has already had a larger share than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation which the gentleman asks is unbudgeted. There is no budget estimate for it. The Committee on Appropriations has received no official request for or notification of the need for any such expenditure. The attempt to gang up on the committee and force this additional expenditure into the bill here on the floor without Budget recommendation or committee consideration is unwarranted and out of keeping with budgetary government. If I should use the gentleman's words I would say truthfully that it is unfair, unjust, and un-American.

This bill is already too large. The committee has been too generous. There is already too much money in the bill, considering the condition of the Treasury. To agree to the gentleman's amendment would be to take that much more money out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the Nation to be spent for the sole benefit of this particular section of Texas. It is time we started paying the national debt and protecting the Nation from inflation and depreciation of its bonds instead of dishing out pork to the querulous gentleman from Texas.

To recapitulate, the hearings of the committee are not secret. They are published in full and are free to any who

want a copy. The Texas delegation, instead of being discriminated against have more members on the committee than any other State. The State of Texas has more appropriations committee assignments. It has more chairmanships. It has more patronage here in the House. It has more money in this bill than any other State in the Union. And yet the gentleman is not satisfied. Mr. Chairman, it is about time the United States issued a second declaration of independence declaring its independence from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most worthy project. Here is a river, the Red River, which is 1,300 miles long. It rises in New Mexico, flows through Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and north Louisiana. The waters of New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas last year descended on this little community and put it under some 12 or 15 feet of water.

Again I say this is a most worthy project, and I should like very much to see it approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is that it is unfortunate that we cannot always allow our desire to accommodate our friends control our actions. Under the circumstances I feel we should stand by the Board of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, and vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) there were—ayes 30, noes 64. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a moment now to more or less clarify this situation, if I can. I do not think anyone will be critical of those who offer amendments to the bill because they know about the projects in their districts, just like the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Louisiana. There is no doubt but what those projects are meritorious, there is no doubt but what construction should be started.

Here is the situation: The President has requested a reduction in expenditures and has recommended that a certain number of millions of dollars will be allocated for the flood-control program. The Army engineers were, therefore, unable to proceed in making request before the committee with more projects than the money requested by the President would allow. They could not exceed the President's program.

This bill is pretty liberal as it is. It provides for more than \$300,000,000 and personally I am not willing to go further than \$300,000,000 at this time. I am one of those who voted against the Florida

barge canal because I do not think it is sufficiently urgent at this time. I see the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] on his feet, a member of the committee, who I am sure shares the same view.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the gentleman that I voted as he did against the Florida barge canal and I have been compelled to vote against these other amendments, not because I am not convinced they are good, meritorious projects, but because of the financial condition of the country at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. As I stated, this bill provides \$300,000,000. Let me make the further statement that when the engineers came in here with a program following the end of the war they submitted to the Congress last December a program which we put into operation. No project that was not submitted by the engineers to the Budget for deficiency action is in this bill today. In other words, the fiscal year 1947 program of the Army engineers for flood control insofar as new projects are concerned is not in this bill. It has been completely excluded and, of course, Members are disappointed, we are all disappointed, but if we are going to hold these expenditures down for rivers and harbors and flood control to \$300,000,000 they have to be cut. That is the fault of nobody. It is simply a matter of trying to protect and preserve the Federal Treasury by deferring these projects until conditions may be more desirable for the prosecution of the projects. The money included in this bill is for the continuation of flood-control projects originally recommended last fall by the engineers to the Budget Bureau. There are some new river and harbor projects.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman said the program will be to defer these projects. That is exactly what I want to know. If it is going to be the plan of the Budget Bureau and of the committee not to permit any new projects to begin at all until these projects are finished, and if it takes years to finish these projects now in the bill and approved by the Budget Bureau, when can we folks who represent other projects ever expect to get relief?

Mr. MAHON. I cannot answer the question. Of course, I know that Congress can increase the amounts if it wants to, but I think most of us want to reduce expenses as much as possible. That is the reason why these projects are not in here. It is not because they are not meritorious. It is not because many of us were not for them. It is because we wanted to conform to the President's request to keep this expenditure within this \$300,000,000 limit.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of economy, and here is the Panama Canal that carries a \$19,000,000 appropriation. How does the gentleman account for his support of that item?

Mr. MAHON. The Panama Canal is the cheapest project that has ever been constructed in the history of America, as anyone familiar with it knows. This Congress would not think for a moment of hamstringing the Panama Canal or of not taking the necessary precaution to keep it in shape. It has helped save our lives once, and we might call upon it again to help us in an emergency. It is a very important peacetime project as well.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 8, line 5, strike out the sum "\$110,814,000" and insert "\$112,314,000, and for the construction of a flood-control project at Sutton, on Elk River, in West Virginia, \$1,000,000, and for flood-control work at Ridgeway, Johnsonburg, Brockway, St. Marys, in Elk County, Pa., the sum of \$500,000."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing projects discussed here that cost fifty to sixty million dollars. I want to talk to the Committee for a short time of one item that costs in the initial appropriation only \$1,000,000, and certainly not anything like the \$60,000,000 projects that are being discussed here this afternoon.

I also want to discuss briefly another item of \$500,000 which involves the State of Pennsylvania. When I was elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress I surveyed the Federal Improvements, public improvements in my district, and I found there were eight federally approved flood-control projects, all of which had been approved by the Congress. I immediately contacted the War Department engineers and inquired whether any of those projects were ready to be constructed, and I was advised that the project at Sutton on the Elk River, the Sutton flood-control dam, was ready to be let to contract; that plans were drawn and specifications written up. They told me that it was top priority in my State of West Virginia.

I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the deficiency appropriation bill. I was asked not to press the item at that time; that it would be included in the 1947 program. I, of course, accepted the committee's interpretation of it that it would be in the 1947 program and did not press the matter and did not offer an amendment on the floor of the House to include it. I did not ask my Senator to have it put in over in the Senate later on. I abided by the understanding I had with the Committee.

When I came back before the committee this time to discuss the 1947 appropriations, I learned that my item was not certified to the Committee on Appropriations. Here is what happened. When the President recommended that the budget be reduced from \$50,000,000,000 to \$38,000,000,000, the Bureau of the Budget found it was necessary to cut out certain items of expenditures, and they worked out on this flood-control program. Now, why could that committee not have spread that amount over these various projects? No. Instead of giving me even one-third of what the Army engineers had recommended, the Bureau

of the Budget saw fit to have a \$3,000,000 appropriation tacked onto a \$1,000,000 appropriation set up in the deficiency bill for the Buggs Island power project. That is the kind of a budget we have. I have said on the floor in general debate that it was favoritism and discrimination and I insist that that is the situation.

Why cannot I have some of the appropriation the Army engineers approved for my project? It is on the watershed of the Allegheny. Ten million dollars spent for flood control there is worth \$50,000,000 spent on the lower Mississippi and the Ohio River Valley. Not a single cent of Federal money has been spent in my district despite the fact that these projects have been approved. This was approved as early as 1941, and no work has been done because of the progress of the war.

Now I am insisting that this committee give consideration to this matter and rectify the discrimination and favoritism shown by the Budget Bureau. I trust that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is interested in this amendment, will make it plain that he appeared before the committee at the same time I appeared. In other words, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are being discriminated against because we acted as gentlemen and kept faith with the committee on the understanding. I trust it will be the pleasure of this committee to insert these two items, one for the Sutton flood-control project and one for the project in Elk County, Pa.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is rather with fear and trepidation that I present the Elk County flood-control project, knowing the attitude of my good friends on the left side of the aisle. I am of the opinion that they are rather ruthless in their determination to eradicate anything in the way of an amendment that might change the complexion of this appropriation bill.

The project I am talking about is the \$6,500,000 project up in my State of Pennsylvania. In 1942 I went through my district and I saw the three towns of Johnsonburg, Ridgeway, and St. Marys after a disastrous flood, where the devastating flood waters had swooped down and destroyed their property, destroyed their homes, and destroyed their industries, and upset the whole economic life of the area with a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The question I want to present to my colleagues is the fact of the economic justification to make investments to prevent these devastating and recurring floods that are periodically visited on these areas, or are we going to continue to permit these floods which harass and haunt and torture these people, who ap-

peal to us for protection from these devastating waters and terrific losses. They are asking for relief and they come to their Government for relief. Just do not brush all these projects off lightly as though they were of no great concern. They are, and these conditions should be and must be corrected.

As my distinguished friend from West Virginia has said, we appeared before the Board of Engineers last year. They said, "Your project will be included in the appropriation bill next year." Therefore, we let the matter rest and did not insist that it be placed in the deficiency appropriation bill last year as we had faith in Army engineers' recommendation that an appropriation would be in this bill. We then came before the Civil Functions Committee. I want to pay my respects to the committee. They were very fair and considerate. After I presented my case, they informed me that the Elk County project was not in the bill, except \$120,000 for engineering work.

I was very much surprised and I was very much shocked to find that even though the engineers had said that an appropriation would be in the bill nothing other than appropriations for engineering was included. My project had been deleted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Suddenly we in the Congress get economy-minded. Is that not wonderful? After 14 years of prolific spending and with a \$300,000,000,000 debt we talk about economy where people are being punished from damaging floods. At the same time we float an \$11,000,000,000 loan that we ask the American taxpayer to pay for, and we are going to give \$4,000,000,000 to the British and \$6,000,000,000 to Russia. So I am appealing to you on this side of the aisle to support this amendment, to give us an opportunity to bring relief to the people who for the last 35 or 40 years have been suffering from these devastating floods and spend some of our own money in our own back yards for the relief of our own people who are paying the taxes.

Up in my district there is the most prolific watershed in the world—11,580 square miles, coming down many tributaries into the Allegheny River contributing four-fifths of the flow of the Ohio River at Pittsburgh, causing tremendous floods and damage every spring and fall in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. These projects, that of the gentleman from West Virginia and mine, will be a contributing factor to the relief of the flood stage at Pittsburgh. Now, I find we do not have an appropriation other than one hundred and twenty thousand for engineering. To whom can we appeal? We represent the people. They ask us for the help, for relief from these flood waters. We come to you, the Congress, and ask for honest consideration and you say nothing can be done at this time. This certainly will not satisfy a people who ask for help. Now, I do not think this is the logical solution of the problem. The projects that already are in this bill possibly are in some cases essential and some not so necessary but the project I am talking about and that of the gentleman from West Virginia, are very important and

action should be taken here today so work can be undertaken. This will bring relief to a suffering people who are appealing to you just as my friends and colleagues here from Louisiana and West Virginia have requested consideration for their projects to help people from devastating flood waters.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Are the Susquehanna and Monongahela Rivers in this?

Mr. GAVIN. They are not. This is the Allegheny-Ohio project.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would support it anyhow if they were.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, that is perfectly splendid. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think in flood-control projects we are making an investment, an investment that is justified to wisely spend the money of the American taxpayers, rather than to carry on these over-all global expenditures like the \$4,000,000,000 loan to Britain that means nothing to the 11,000,000 people of my State, as well as to the people of your States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 29, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including gratuities and necessary clothing for indigent discharged prisoners \$2,424,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: On page 14, line 10, after the figures, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language: "Provided, That \$18,000 of such amount shall be immediately available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

According to the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STIGLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5400), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a gentleman in St. Petersburg, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECULATIVE REAL-ESTATE BUILDERS
HOARD SCARCE MATERIALS, SMALL
BUILDERS BEING DRIVEN TO WALL—
TIME HAS COME FOR BOLD ACTION TO
MEET HOUSING CRISIS—\$4,000 HOMES
SOLD FOR \$15,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago I stood before the House and made the prediction that, unless swift and drastic action was taken to meet the housing crisis, the speculative real-estate builders would gobble up available building materials and bankrupt their legitimate small competitors.

Today I have a concrete example of a real-estate speculator who has done just that. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is but one example of similar occurrences that are taking place in every State in the Union. I maintain that it is a national disgrace for us to sit here idly, doing nothing—permitting these speculative profiteers to gobble up little competitors, build houses for the wealthy—while our returning veterans walk the streets of our cities, unable to find shelter.

Mr. Speaker, we already have delayed too long in taking the proper steps to stop such monopolistic practices. We must bring back a business climate where smaller, responsible builders can compete on a fair basis.

I first brought the scarcity of homes to the attention of the House last October. Since then some action has been taken, but there has been stalling, quibbling, arguing over half-way measures that do not begin to attack the problem with the vigor and imagination that is required to meet it. I want to urge now, with every force that is within me, that the administration leaders discard the timid cautiousness it has so far exhibited and take the bold steps necessary to bring housing for our veterans.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include this letter from Mr. Herman R. Price, of St. Petersburg, Fla.:

GENERAL DRAFTING SERVICE,
St. Petersburg, Fla., February 3, 1946.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Subject: The reasons back of material shortages in our city which prevent the building of GI homes.

DEAR SIR: We have on file complete plans and specifications for 28 GI homes and 64 other small homes, which cannot be built, because of the following reasons:

1. Previous to the enactment of the present priority laws, big developers completely stripped the local lumber dealers of all types of materials which they stacked up on the site of the proposed building for future use.

2. They purchased in advance, paying exorbitant prices, all materials before they were delivered.

3. They temporarily purchased the whole lumber yard to prevent anyone else from getting materials until after they had an opportunity to sell at inflation prices the houses which they have already built or plan to build.

4. They have tied up all labor at premium prices, to an extent that none of the old reliable contractors which would normally build GI homes can meet them.

5. They are charging \$15,000 for a home that can be built with a fair and reasonable profit to all for \$4,000.

Trusting that the foregoing information may be helpful to you in your important work.

Yours truly,

HERMAN R. PRICE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an account of a case delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation magazine.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article or a speech by Charles Lindbergh.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to do so. The first order of business will be House Joint Resolution 265. That resolution has passed the Senate, and the Senate resolution is on the Speaker's desk. It provides for proceeding with certain river and harbor improvements to be prosecuted after the termination of the war, striking out a provision that no project herein authorized shall be appro-

priated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars, and so forth.

After that is disposed of, if time permits, it is my intention to call up H. R. 1118. That is a bill to make the Hatch Act more humane.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that possible?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very doubtful, I will agree; nevertheless this is a legislative attempt to put a little humanity into the Hatch Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just as a matter of information: On yesterday the House put through a bill sentencing a man to deprivation for life of the benefits of sections 8, 9, and 10 of the National Labor Relations Act under certain circumstances. Are you going to put some humanity into that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan and I voted the same way on that today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know how the gentleman from Massachusetts voted.

Mr. McCORMACK. I voted "no" on the Case bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So did I. I am glad to know how the gentleman from Massachusetts voted.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan and I were on the same side.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For once.

Mr. McCORMACK. For once; yes.

I say that in all sincerity. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan. I want him to know that even in disagreement I know the gentleman is sincere in his motives, and I want the gentleman to understand that no matter how much we may disagree I profoundly respect him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that respect is exceeded only by my respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and include therein a release from the Treasury Department.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and include certain excerpts and correspondence and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 2.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Toledo (Ohio) Times.

BILLIONS FOR BRITAIN, AND SO ON

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a copy of a resolution I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, very shortly a House committee will begin hearings on the President's proposal to lend \$3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, carrying with it the cancellation of almost \$30,000,000,000 of old debts from the First World War and of the lend-lease transactions arising out of our advancements to Britain before and during World War II. The joint resolution upon which these hearings will be based is entitled "To further implement the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom and for other purposes."

I have today introduced a joint resolution bearing exactly the same title, but proposing a different plan to carry out the administration's agreement with the United Kingdom.

The wave of propaganda flowing out of this administration to put over the British loan, and, consequently, other loans to other nations that will be expected to follow, is already coming at the American people like a torrent. We hear it on the radio. We read it in official publications of the Government. Recent issues of the Department of State Bulletin, a fancy publication printed on the finest of scarce paper, and paid for by the American taxpayers, carry stories on the British loan. All of them predict the dire consequences that will follow to American trade and commerce if we do not swallow all of this loan propaganda in one gulp. The January 20 issue of this publication carries an article, *The British Loan—What It Means to Us*, by the Secretary of the Treasury and Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State. The January 27 issue of this same publication carries an article entitled "The Significance of the British Loan" by Clair Wilcox. Mr. Wilcox, incidentally happens to be the Director of the Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State. And so, on and on we watch this process of taxpayers' money being used to propagandize the same taxpayers to carry out the administration's program.

Under the joint resolution that I have introduced, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell bonds not in excess of \$3,750,000,000, and any money derived from the sale of such bonds shall be used to carry out the proposed loan to Great Britain. Payments of either principal or interest to the holders of such bonds shall be made solely from amounts repaid to us by Great Britain under the agreement. Express provision is made that the United States shall be under no obligation to the holders of such bonds with respect to either principal or interest. Each bond shall bear on its face a statement to the effect that it is not backed by the credit of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

Doubtless there are many people in these United States who favor the proposed loan to Great Britain. To contend otherwise would be to admit that the program of propaganda emanating from

this Government had failed completely in its mission. All those people who desire to participate in the loan would, under this proposal, have the opportunity of doing so. On the other hand, these additional billions of dollars of charges would not be placed upon the backs of the rest of the American people, who, neither as individuals nor as taxpayers nor as bond buyers, feel that they are able to carry the load.

Let those who are so anxious that this loan be made buy as much of it as they want. But do not saddle it on the backs of the rest of us who want none of it.

The following is a copy of the joint resolution:

Joint resolution to further implement the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes

Whereas in the Bretton Woods Agreements Act the Congress has declared it to be the policy of the United States "to seek to bring about further agreement and cooperation among nations and international bodies, as soon as possible, on ways and means which will best reduce obstacles to and restrictions upon international trade, eliminate unfair trade practices, promote mutually advantageous commercial relations, and otherwise facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade and promote the stability of international economic relations"; and

Whereas in further implementation of the purposes of the Bretton Woods agreements, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have negotiated an agreement dated December 6, 1945, designed to expedite the achievement of stable and orderly exchange arrangements, the prompt elimination of exchange restrictions and discriminations, and other objectives of the above-mentioned policy declared by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, is hereby authorized to carry out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom which was transmitted by the President to the Congress on January 30, 1946.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide funds for carrying out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow, from time to time, not in excess of \$3,750,000,000, and to issue therefor bonds in the form and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use the proceeds of such bonds for the purpose of carrying out the agreement.

(b) Bonds issued pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the same provisions for amortization and interest (including waiver of interest) as are provided in the agreement with respect to repayment by the United Kingdom. Payments on account of principal and interest shall be made solely from amounts paid by the United Kingdom under the agreement, but the United States shall be under no obligation to the holders of such bonds with respect to principal or interest.

(c) Bonds herein authorized shall from time to time be offered as a popular loan under such regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury as will in his opinion give the people of the United States as nearly as may be an equal opportunity to participate therein.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the bonds herein authorized shall be issued in the same manner, so far as is consistent with the provisions of this section, as bonds issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. They shall be of distinctive design and shall bear on their face a statement to the effect that they are not backed by the credit of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

(e) No payments shall be made to the United Kingdom under the agreement or this joint resolution except from the proceeds of bonds issued under the provisions of this section.

(f) Inasmuch as bonds issued under this section are not obligations of the United States, such bonds shall not be considered for the purpose of the debt limit of the United States.

(g) The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide by regulation for the distribution on an equitable basis among the holders of such bonds of payments of principal and interest received from the United Kingdom.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT WASTE TOO MUCH TIME

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to attach thereto an editorial on Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am reading part of an editorial, which states:

These issues should keep Congress pretty busy. How each Congressman votes, of course, is important; but it is even more important that each casts his vote according to his convictions on the will of all of the people in his district, rather than listen to the pressure groups who, without having been elected, would appropriate the votes of Congressmen.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT WASTE TOO MUCH TIME

Trains and air liners headed for Washington today will carry most of Congress back to their seats, where they will face a difficult session with five finger-burning issues to shape into legislation.

Congress would have a much easier job pleasing the people if only the people would agree on the laws they want. But Congress always finds there are at least two sides to every major question. The Congressman's problem is which way to go—which side to select in casting his vote.

The issue which will get the most attention, and probably the most delicate for the vote-minded legislators, is labor and strike legislation. The labor blocs are strong in Washington, and they talk straight to Congressmen. It is not unusual for a Congressman to be threatened with defeat in the next election unless he bends to the will of the labor bloc. Some Congressmen tell the labor lobby to go fly a kite, while others, weaker, surrender their own convictions in the interest of keeping their jobs.

What any legislator should consider foremost in making a decision is what is good for his district. He must decide this himself. If he tries to please everyone, he finds he cannot do it. If he straddles an issue, he usually finds he pleases no one. This leaves him uncomfortably in the middle when he starts his next campaign.

Congress should remember that the public at large does not like strikes. The public

wants production to get under way. The public wants cars, radios, household equipment, clothing, telephone, and telegraph service. To enable the Government to be helpful in settling labor disputes quickly, the Congressman should keep only the public in mind and let the pressure groups, whether they are labor or management, howl their heads off. Any self-respecting Congressman will follow this course.

Loans to foreign countries will occupy attention. If unemployment continues widespread, or gets worse, there may be some feeling against foreign loans. But in this issue Congress should remember that we have just sacrificed a quarter of a million lives and some \$300,000,000,000 to win a war. If money will destroy the seeds of unrest which might grow into another war, we had better let the impoverished countries of Europe and the Orient have a few dollars, at least, until they can get their own business and agriculture operating.

Congress is almost sure to extend price controls for another short period. Such a step would not be popular with manufacturers or the producers of raw materials, but the general public is in favor of continued price controls until the edge is taken off the backlog of demand.

Two phases of the military will come before Congress. One is the merger of the Army and Navy. The other is a program for compulsory military training in peacetime. It is doubtful, if the merger will become a fact without considerable compromise, even though the President is in favor of it. Compulsory military training should be adopted, first, to relieve soldiers now in service who deserve to be released, and secondly, to provide the nucleus of a defensive army so we cannot be caught flat-footed again should a war break out suddenly.

These issues should keep Congress pretty busy. How each Congressman votes, of course, is important, but it is even more important that each casts his vote according to his convictions on the will of all of the people in his district rather than listen to the pressure groups who without having been elected would appropriate the votes of Congressmen.

Congress can expedite the postwar adjustment and settle most of the major issues very promptly by using a little courage and a little common sense. But the legislators should not exercise their vocal cords too long while Rome burns.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 311, which was introduced on January 30, 1946, is a resolution, according to its title, "To further implement the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes."

The agreement referred to in this resolution is the British loan. I am opposed to this loan and in the remarks which are to follow I will state the reasons why. On December 6, 1945, President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee announced Anglo-American financial and commercial agreements which include three documents:

First. Financial agreement.

Second. Joint statement regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy.

Third. Joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease and reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims.

The joint settlement regarding lend-lease, surplus and war claims provides for the payment by the United Kingdom of six hundred and fifty million in full settlement for such items. This sum is repayable on the same terms as the repayment of the proposed line of credit in the financial agreement. This sum agreed upon in settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims is unduly small. At the time lend-lease was extended administration spokesmen claimed that it would be repaid. At this point I am inserting in the RECORD information relative to lend-lease.

Lend-lease aid, by country, March 1941 to Oct. 1, 1945

Country:	Amount
British Empire.....	\$30,269,210,000
U. S. S. R.....	10,801,131,000
France.....	1,406,600,000
China.....	631,509,000
American Republics...	421,467,000
Netherlands.....	162,157,000
Greece.....	75,416,000
Belgium.....	52,443,000
Norway.....	34,640,000
Turkey.....	28,063,000
Yugoslavia.....	25,885,000
Other countries.....	43,284,000
Aid not charged to foreign governments...	2,088,249,000
Total lend-lease aid...	46,040,054,000

We gave the British Empire approximately \$30,000,000,000 worth of goods through lend-lease; reverse lend-lease amounts to slightly more than \$4,000,000,000. We have agreed to settle for six hundred and fifty million and this is to be paid over a period of 50 years.

PROPOSALS CONCERNING WORLD TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

The proposals on world trade and employment, to which Great Britain promises her support, call for an international conference on this subject to be held not later than the coming summer, with a view to removing barriers to international trade, and to setting up a world-trade organization. Draft plans for such an organization are included. Approval of the Bretton Woods agreements is also recognized as desirable. Great Britain does not agree to relinquish the system of imperial preference, but does agree to negotiate the reduction of special tariff privileges in return for tariff reductions on the part of the United States. Britain is permitted to continue bulk buying by the Government for the present.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

The financial agreement provides for extension by the United States to the United Kingdom of a line of credit, amounting to \$3,750,000,000 to be drawn upon at any time between the effective date of the agreement and December 31, 1951. The effective date will be the date on which the United States Government notifies the United Kingdom Government that the Congress of the United States has made available the funds necessary to extend the line of credit. The amount drawn is to be repaid with interest at 2 percent per year, in 50 annual install-

ments, beginning December 31, 1951. The Government of the United Kingdom may accelerate the repayment.

Current payments of interest shall be waived in any year by request of the United Kingdom, if the Government finds that such a waiver is necessary in view of present and prospective international exchange conditions and the International Monetary Fund makes a stipulation of necessity based on certain stipulated factors.

The proceeds of the loan may not be used by the United Kingdom to discharge its obligations to other countries. Nor may interest be waived unless other countries to which Britain owes money also waive interest.

Within 1 year after the effective date of the agreement, or less, the Government of the United Kingdom will complete arrangements to remove any discrimination arising from the sterling-area dollar pool. Subject to the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, the United Kingdom agrees not to impose restrictions on payments and transfers on current transactions and to eliminate such controls, with certain exceptions, within 1 year of the effective date of the agreement.

The two countries also agree to lift quantitative restrictions against imports from the other country not later than December 31, 1946, again with certain exceptions. The United Kingdom also agrees to enter into early negotiations with other countries for settling blocked sterling accounts.

THE LOAN IS TOO GREAT A BURDEN

In the first place the loan is too great a burden on the already overburdened American taxpayers. We have heavy obligations to meet, such as pensions for veterans. Furthermore, the public debt is between \$278,000,000,000 and \$279,000,000,000. I doubt the ability of the United States to lend money to other countries when we have such a heavy burden of debt in our own country. In contrast to our public debt, I am informed that the public debt of Great Britain is approximately \$98,000,000,000. I cannot see how we can obtain the money to lend the United Kingdom unless we borrow it from our people by floating bonds or raise it by means of taxation. Furthermore, if we extend this loan it will be a precedent for loans to other countries. All the demands for loans should be reviewed since to refuse to lend money to others would generate ill-will toward the United States. It is most important that we determine just what our lending policy is going to be. As far as the British loan is concerned, it should be emphasized that the 50-year period allowed for repayment is far too long.

RATE OF INTEREST

The rate of interest on the proposed British loan is exceedingly low. It is in reality not 2 percent but 1.62 percent since payments do not begin until the end of 1951. This rate of interest is lower than the rate the Treasury must pay to obtain the money it borrows from our people. The average rate of interest our Government pays on all types of

securities is 1.94 percent. This difference of course will have to be made up by a gift from our people. In this connection it is well to point out that the rate charged is lower than that charged to our veterans, which rate is not to exceed 4 percent. It is not good business to lend money in this manner.

LOAN IS UNSECURED

The loan is risky because it is unsecured. No bank or no individual lends money without security. I am opposed to lending the British Commonwealth or any other nation money without adequate security. There might well be provisions for acquisition of bases and for other rights. Consideration should be given to the pledging of British assets in the United States as security. The British investments in the United States at the end of 1944 according to the United States Department of Commerce are—

[In millions of dollars]

Long-term investments:	
Common stocks at market value	505
Preferred stocks at market value	118
Bonds at market value	12
	635
Direct investments:	
British controlled property at book value	1,031
Miscellaneous investments:	
Asset value estimated by capitalizing income	335
Total long term	2,001
Short-term investments:	
Reported by bankers and brokers, total	869
Total	2,870
Foregoing are rough estimates.	

I call attention to an excerpt from a radio address by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman GERALD W. LANDIS, over Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 2. Complete address is in the RECORD of February 4.

Why should we make this loan to Britain? They now own 1,500,000 shares in United States industries. They have unmined gold reserves of \$24,500,000,000, unmined diamond reserve of \$8,800,000,000, and \$14,000,000,000 in foreign investments. Let her use these assets before coming over here with cup in hand.

We should not lend money without definite security and I for one am opposed to voting for this loan unless we get something in return.

BRITAIN WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PAY

Britain cannot repay the loan. She will not be able to produce sufficient exports quickly enough. Even if she did, we should not be willing to take them since her goods would compete with our domestic production to the detriment of our workers. If the loan is not paid, loss will result to the United States through loss of capital assets. Evidence that Britain will not be able to pay is the fact that she has not paid her World War I debt to us.

I am including in the RECORD the United States loans to Great Britain and British payments on these loans for World War I.

United States loans to Great Britain and British payments on these loans, World War I

Principal of obligations received by the United States from Great Britain under Liberty bond acts World War I	
Payments received from Great Britain prior to funding of the debt (Dec. 15, 1922):	\$4,277,000,000.00
Principal	202,181,641.56
Principal at time of funding	4,074,818,358.44
Interest	\$357,896,657.11
Interest due	529,307,727.30
Total indebtedness of Great Britain at time of funding	
Less: Credit allowances and cash payments on execution of agreement	4,604,128,085.74
	4,128,085.74
Debt as funded	
Payments received from Great Britain subsequent to funding up to July 1, 1945:	4,600,000,000.00
Principal	232,000,000.00
Principal outstanding July 1, 1945	4,368,000,000.00
Interest	\$1,232,770,518.42
Interest due, July 1, 1945	2,047,664,782.58
Total indebtedness as of July, 1945	
	6,415,664,782.58
Principal and interest paid amounts to a total of	
	2,024,848,817.09

Source: U. S. Treasury Department memorandum covering the World War indebtedness of foreign governments.

SOCIALISM AND IMPERIALISM

The loan would be used to finance socialism in Great Britain through a broad program of reconstruction and nationalization of industry, to the detriment of our system of free enterprise. The loan may be a detriment to the cause of world peace, because it will bolster British imperialism in the Far East. Also it will foster friction between Britain and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the British loan because, in my opinion, this country cannot afford to make it; that it is unsecured and therefore poor business; that it will not be repaid to the United States; and that we will not obtain anything in return for the extension of this line of credit. It appears to me that we will again be attempting to finance our export trade. It is time for the United States to pay some attention to its own interests. We cannot continue to give this country away and maintain our position of leadership. We cannot continue to give this country away and remain prosperous.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SECRET DIPLOMACY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand last week's Life, in which there is contained the second secret speech carried by Life that Mr. Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, made to the House of Commons during the war. This is the secret speech made to the House of Commons on December 10, 1942, and explains why Mr. Churchill dealt with Admiral Darlan and the Vichy Government.

Mr. Speaker, Life states in part as follows:

Last week Life published for the first time one of the secret speeches made by Mr. Churchill to closed sessions of the House of

Commons during the war. That historic address concerned principally an explanation of the fall of Singapore. Herewith Life presents another such secret speech by Mr. Churchill, also never before published. This address was made to the House of Commons on December 10, 1942, a month and 2 days after the Allied landings in north Africa, and is an answer to the protests aroused by Allied dealings with Admiral Darlan, No. 2 man of the Vichy regime and an open advocate of collaboration with Germany. In referring to these eventful utterances, Mr. Churchill states, "They are far more interesting than anything that could be written subsequently about these tremendous situations. The effect they produced upon the House of Commons was of course decisive, and all opposition and most of the criticism faded away before the gravity of events." As straightforward documents of living history, these speeches will doubtless come to be considered among the most significant commentaries of the war.

These secret speeches made by Mr. Churchill to the Parliament bring to my mind very vividly the contrasting policy of our own administration in dealing with the Congress of the United States during the tragic and crucial war period through which we have just passed. The administration will continue to keep many international matters secret from the Congress of the United States. I am not suggesting that all of these things should be made public to all the people of the United States because there are many enemies in our midst today, and war secrets should not be given to them, but I do maintain, and have always maintained, that no secret should be kept from the Congress, the most direct representatives of the people of the United States. Repeatedly in the past on this floor of Congress I have urged the administration to give the Congress information on foreign affairs so that we may be informed of the policies of our Government. We should not be kept in the dark. During the war tragic errors were made, and during the war and since the war costly international commitments have been made which could have been averted if the Congress had been kept informed. However, the administration will continue to keep matters secret from the chosen representatives of the people just so long as the Congress is willing to put up with that sort of thing. The responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is therefore ours to see that we are given full and complete information as to what is to be done in our international affairs. Only then can we vote wisely and effectively.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, from February 8 to February 14, on account of official and personal business.

To Mr. COURTNEY (at the request of Mr. KEFAUVER), for 4 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 8, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1042. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$836,000 for the Department of Agriculture, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1043. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$29,844,208, together with a draft of a proposed provision, for the Department of State, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 454); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1044. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 350 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1045. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1046. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

1047. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1048. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. Pursuant to House Resolution 60 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), submitting part 2, Eighth Report (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1498. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; with amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5356. A bill to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report

No. 1530. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5417. A bill to authorize the construction of irrigation and reclamation works and protective works therefor, to carry out the provisions of a contract with the Coachella Valley County Water District; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 5418. A bill to prohibit the export of grain from the United States for a certain period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5419. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5420. A bill to expedite making homes available for veterans at lower costs and in greater volume and speed by facilitating private industrial production of homes through the use of surplus plants and facilities and new types of materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, so as to achieve maximum production, eliminate impediments thereto created by certain policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to further implement the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee on equal pay for equal work without regard to race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 512. Resolution for the relief of Catherine L. Harrington; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 513. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5356, a bill to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of E. W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of the Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of Lester A. Desse; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1532. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition signed by 471 citizens of California, stating that the United States Employment Service and its

northern California operations, does not have an adequate staff and space to assist citizens in finding employment and that thousands of citizens have great difficulty in obtaining any assistance from the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

1533. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Letter from F. C. Seideman, Kenosha, Wis., in appreciation for the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded him as a member of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1534. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, relating to reconversion and industrial disputes, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

1535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Central Trades Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their objection to passage of House bill 5262; to the Committee on Labor.

1536. Also, petition of Local Union 131, United Construction Workers, United Mine Workers of America, A. F. of L., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to the Case bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1537. Also, petition of John C. Burt, 15 Park Row, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to vindicating authority in delimiting the powers of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most holy and merciful God, the strength of our weakness, the refuge of our weariness, the Good Shepherd of our waywardness, in the searching light of Thy presence, we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against Thy righteous law of love. In an hour of dire human need, Thou hast opened before us a potent ministry to all the earth. Save us from the pride of self-will, from enfeebling faults of judgment, from the blindness of prejudice, from vagueness of purpose, and from discouragement in temporary failure. Lift up our hearts in glad expectation because, with a new era of world cooperation at the door, redemption draweth nigh; enable us to trim our lamps and at the midnight cry go forth to meet the Bridegroom. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the Senate for the days from the 18th of January to the 7th of February, both inclusive, be approved without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal for the various days mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky is approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4908. An act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5400. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the message.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1161.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The account of expenditures set forth in the report is of so important a nature that the Chair thinks the report should be printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD, without the illustrations, for the information of the Senate.

The report, without the illustrations, is as follows:

CHAPTER 1. SUMMARY OF THIRD QUARTER DEVELOPMENTS

The third quarter of 1945 brought final military victory to the United Nations. The end of hostilities greatly affected the problems of relief. VE-day enabled UNRRA to enter into full-scale operations in the liberated countries of Europe which required its aid, as well as to assist in the care and repatriation of millions of displaced persons freed from years of Nazi slave labor. With VJ-day, UNRRA could begin operations on a world-wide scale, as ports were opened in China. Shipping and supplies in adequate quantities became available for UNRRA's accelerated operations, including large supplies of military surplus stocks. As the supply problem diminished the financial problem grew, and by the end of the third quarter of 1945 virtual exhaustion of UNRRA's financial resources became its most immediate problem.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

1. At the end of the third quarter of 1945 cumulative shipments of relief materials from all sources totaled 2,126,222 long tons, valued at \$433,816,000—landed cost. Whereas about half of the shipments included in the total for the second quarter of 1945 were taken over from the civilian relief stocks of military authorities, almost all the supplies shipped during the third quarter were directly procured and shipped by UNRRA. Third quarter shipments, equivalent to more than 135 full shiploads, were more than double those of the preceding quarter. Included were 616,840 tons of food, 237,150 tons of industrial rehabilitation supplies, 106,865 tons of agricultural rehabilitation supplies, 56,558 tons of clothing, textiles, and footwear, and 7,811 tons of medical supplies.

2. As of September 30, UNRRA had expended or committed over 88 percent of its available resources. Of the \$1,268,750,254 comprising operating contributions to date—including the entire United States contribution—the sum of \$1,122,131,582 had been committed for relief and rehabilitation supplies and services. Of the \$15,415,334 available for administrative expenditures, \$11,692,128 had been committed. For all purposes, UNRRA had a balance of \$150,341,878 available for commitment as of the end of the third quarter of 1945.

3. Operations were stepped up during the third quarter in the countries of central, eastern, and southern Europe. Agreements were signed between UNRRA and the Governments of Poland, Albania, and the Dodecanese Islands. Increased quantities of supplies were shipped into Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Unloading problems were in part overcome by the opening of the ports of Gdynia and Gdansk for Poland, Bremerhaven and Hamburg for Czechoslovakia, and Trieste for Yugoslavia.

4. As of September 30, 4,323 UNRRA workers were employed in the operation of assembly centers established by the military for Allied displaced persons in Germany, while 449 other UNRRA personnel were in a forward staging area awaiting deployment into the field. About 1,300,000 displaced persons were still being cared for in these assembly centers. While negotiations were under way for UNRRA to take over direction of displaced persons operations from the military, UNRRA personnel were "winterizing" the centers.

5. Over 27,000 displaced persons had been repatriated from UNRRA's Middle East camps by the beginning of September, and a remaining 13,000 were being sent home as fast as shipping permitted.

6. The wrecking of inland transport systems during the war constituted a grave threat to the relief program. To overcome this, UNRRA had arranged for the procurement of approximately 50,000 trucks for Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

7. UNRRA's program of limited aid to Italy was in full operation, and most of the \$50,000,000 authorized for the Italian program had been committed. About 800,000 children and expectant and nursing mothers were receiving supplementary food in provinces south of Florence. Operations were beginning in certain northern provinces. School lunch programs were operating in Rome and Naples and soon would be extended throughout Italy.

8. VJ-day necessitated a rapid increase of UNRRA personnel in China. The draft of a basic UNRRA-Chinese Government agreement was in the final stages of negotiation in September. UNRRA medical personnel combated a cholera epidemic in the Chungking area during the third quarter. From June 2 to August 18 over 2,300 persons were given emergency hospitalization, and 500,000 were inoculated. Mortality among patients fell from 40 percent to about 10 percent. Procurement for China got under way on a large scale during this quarter.

9. While the countries of western Europe have been financing most of their own relief and rehabilitation needs, they have received through UNRRA large shipments of clothing contributed by citizens of the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. At the end of September approximately 3,000,000 pounds had been sent to Belgium, 7,000,000 to France, 4,000,000 to the Netherlands, and 1,000,000 to Norway.

10. Emergency relief shipments arrived in the Philippines in September. The shipments included 12,398,400 pounds of food and over 93,000 pounds of medical supplies. More than 4,000,000 pounds of contributed clothing were made available for shipment to the islands.